

A N 8
EXAMINATION
O F

Mr. J. B--'s *POSTSCRIPT*;

Acknowledg'd by himself to be

No *Full* and *Perfect* ANSWER to the
PAPERS Written against him.

By *Matthew French*, M. A. Junior-Fellow of *Trinity College*, and
Curate of *St. Warbrough's Church, Dublin*.

*We do assert, That every Church is bound to observe the Institutions of Christ,
and that sort of Government which the Apostles did Ordain, consisting of
Bishops, Priests and People. Barrow's Unity of the Church, p. 301.*

*The late Cardinal Barberini said, HE COULD BE CONTENTED
THERE WERE NO PRIESTS IN ENGLAND, SO THERE
WERE NO BISHOPS. Pref. to Dr. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness
of Separation, pag. 9.*

D U B L I N :

Printed by *A. Rhames*, at the Back of *Dick's- Coffee-House* in
Skinner-Row, MDCCIX.

To the Reader

TO THE
READER.

MR. Boyse does acknowledge, that his Postscript, though very large, is no full and perfect Answer ; he having design'd not to enter on the particular and close Examination of the Papers Written against him. Now though I must confess this his Acknowledgment is very Just and True ; yet I thought it convenient to observe the several things [sometimes particular Arguments, sometimes whole Sections in my Answer] which he has quite over-look'd, and given no Reply to in his Postscript. And accordingly, I have done this in the First, Fifth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Chapters of the following Treatise.

I hope

To the Reader.

I hope Mr. B---, if he shall think fit to Reply, will enter on the particular and close Examination of 'em.

As to the few Exceptions Mr. B--- has made, I assure You, I have particularly
* Chap. 2, *Examin'd 'em* *, *and given a distinct Answer to each of 'em ; which I humbly submit to your Opinion and Judgment.*

3, 4, 6.

A N

The Introduction.

IT is very evident to every Person, that is pleas'd to read over Mr. B---'s *Postscript* to his *Sermon* and *Appendix*, that he principally levels against one of his *Answerers*, Mr. Dr---, and spends the greatest part of his Book upon him; some few Pages only he thinks fit to bestow upon me. Mr. B--- best knows what Reason mov'd him to make such a Difference. I should have thought my self very much obliged to him, had he given me as particular an Answer as I gave him, or even quitted himself from those things I charg'd him with in my *Preface*. I do not remember any one Argument I omitted, or pass'd over without a particular Consideration, [nor does Mr. B--- charge me with any Omission of this kind] I might therefore reasonably have expected, that in a *Postscript* consisting of 118 Pages, he would have dealt after the same manner with me.

But he tells us in a way of Excuse, * 'I design not in this' *Postscript* to enter on the particular and close Examination of those Answers. — I shall at present content my self with a few brief Remarks; and I do so the rather, because I am told, there are other *Answers* to that *Sermon* expected; and 'tis but reasonable that I should patiently attend to [Another Man would have said, wait for] all that will be said for my Conviction of those Errors which my Answerers are pleased to charge me with; and 'tis not improbable, that some Abler Pen will produce what may much more deserve to be Examined, than any thing I have met with in those two Discourses. And again he tells us *, 'he reserves the Consideration of the rest to a fuller Answer. — Now may not the two Gentlemen (for so Mr. B--- calls his Answerers *) suggest this as a Reason why they think his Answer very defective and unsatisfactory, the very Complaint he makes against them? Mr. B--- attends to what some Abler Pen will produce, which may much more deserve to be examin'd, than any thing he has met in these two Discourses; and yet acknowledges that Mr. Dr— and Mr. Fr— have done him the Honour to write against his

* *Postscr.* p. 1.
* *Pag.* 75.
* *Pag.* 1, 73.
* *Sermon* *.

- * Pag. 1. *Sermon* *. If this Expression be *candid* and *sincere*, if Mr. E--- really thinks we *have done him an Honour in Writing against him*, (to increase the Obligation on us, arising from his great Humility and Condescension in this Acknowledgement) he might, methinks, have spar'd his many *injurious Reflections on both his Answerers, but especially Mr. Dr---*. He might not in so Solemn a manner as he does *, have reproach'd us with Ignorance of, or Unacquaintedness with all the Authors he himself has read and
- * Pag. 57. ' knows *, the *Juells*, (for the knowing Mr. B--- speaks in the ' Plural Number) the *Willetts*, the *Whitakers*, the *Reinolds*, the ' *Ushers*, the *Masons*, and other Learned Defenders of the Prote- ' stant Cause against the Papists; the *Dailles*, the *Blondells*, the ' *Bocharts*, the *Capellus's*, the *Placens's*, the *Amyrals*, the *Le Blancs*, ' the *Clauds*, the *L'Aroques*, the *Furiens's*, and other Glorious ' Lights of the Reformation. Where shall we get an *Abler Pen* for
- * Pag. 100. *this Man of vast Reading* *? — But instead of waiting for the Consideration of the rest of my Arguments, which Mr. B--- reserves to a fuller Answer, I shall proceed to examine what is contained in this imperfect Answer of his large *Postscript*. In doing this, I shall still observe the Method of my Answer, and in each part of it shew what Mr. B--- has been pleas'd to give no Reply to, and what he has excepted against. I know he has in his *Postscript* cast some Reflections upon me (as that ' I don't read carefully what I pretend to answer *. That I offer what signifies nothing to the
- * Pag. 64. Argument *. That I make precarious and improbable Suppositions for
- * Pag. 73. certain Matters of Fact *. That I make the Expressions of the Inspired
- * Pag. 76. Writer to be a mere Tautology *. That i^y have read Irenæus, I over-
- * Pag. 77. look many Passages in him *, &c. But let the Impartial Reader
- * Pag. 85. judge, whether these Reflection are well grounded, from what I shall hereafter offer in my Defence. In the mean time let me put Mr. B--- in mind of an Expression us'd by the Honourable
- * Against Mr. Boyle *. ' Chew'd Bullets are not more against the Law of
- Bentley, P. ' Arms, than such ways of Speech are against the Rules of
- 12: ' good Writings.

AN EXAMINATION OF Mr. J. B--'s Postscript.

CHAP. I.

Wherein are contained the SEVERAL ACCUSATIONS against Mr. B—, in the Preface of my Answer; to which he has made no Reply.

I SAID *, that J. B—, in proving his Opinion hath AD- * *Answ. p. 2.*
DED SOME WORDS TO SCRIPTURE, upon
which the Strength of his Argument does entirely de-
pend; and this I prov'd at large *. Now I don't find * *Answ. p. 13.*
that Mr. B— in his whole *Postscript* says any thing by way of
Defence. Methinks, TO ADD TO THE SCRIPTURE is a
Crime so heinous, that a Man should be most unwilling to lie
under the Imputation of it; and rather should endeavour by all
possible means to purge and acquit himself; at least, it might be
expected, he should retract, and fairly own his Fault. Till
Mr. B— does one of these two things, I cannot with-draw my
Accusation. It is strange he should be so forgetful, when in his
Postscript entring upon the Discussion of that Question, whether
the Elders called to *Miletus* from *Ephesus*, were *Bishops* of *Asia*,
and resolving to consider what Mr. Dr— and Mr. Fr— had of-
fer'd thereupon, he is pleas'd to use these Words *. 'And be- * *Postsc. p. 75.*
cause Mr. Fr—'s *Answer* has on this Head all in it that Mr. Dr—
has offer'd, and something more, I shall consider what he has
offer'd, to take off the Force of my Argument. Now the very
second thing I offer'd * was, that J. B. has plainly added to the * *See Answer,*
B 2 Text *pag. 13.*

An Examination of

Text those Words [of *Ephesus*] upon which the present Dispute does principally, if not altogether, depend. And yet Mr. B—, who professes to *consider what I had offer'd*, does not take any notice of this. I now again take occasion of putting him in mind of this his Omission and Forgetfulness, and desire he would be pleas'd to remember it the next time.

2. I said, 'that *J. B.* hath ALTER'D THE TRANSLATION OF THE SCRIPTURE in Opposition to all Interpreters, and to the Sense of the Phrase, wherever it occurs in Scripture. This I prov'd at large*. But Mr. B— has altogether over-look'd this Accusation, and says not one Word in Defence of himself in his whole *Postscript*. I take it then for granted, that Mr. B— acknowledges the Truth of this Accusation, and will allow 'I should not prefer his Fancy before the constant use of those Expressions in the Sacred Writers, as he himself speaks. *Postscr.* p. 77.

* *Answ.* pag. 38, 19.

3. I said, 'that *J. B.* builds his Opinion upon the Testimony of several Authors, and yet never refers to the particular Pages of them. See Examples of this in his *Sermon*, p. 409, 411, 419, 438, 439, 441. But Mr. B— has altogether over-look'd this Accusation. I might have expected, that in the Second Edition of his *Sermon*, Revis'd by himself, he would have added the References; but he has not done it: Nay, he is fallen into the same Fault in his *Postscript*, p. 83, 84, 86, 94, 95, 150.

4. I said, 'that *J. B.* insists much upon the Authority of Dr. *Whitby*; and quotes him, when he seems to favour his Opinion; but quite over-looks him, when he is against it. This I proved, *Answ.* 23, 32. But Mr. B— in his *Postscript*, says not one Word in Defence of himself. Nay, he is again guilty of the same Fault (as I shall shew hereafter) with respect to *Chamier* and Dr. *Barrow* (whose Testimonies he insists upon.) *Postscr.* p. 87, 107.

C H A P. II.

Wherein are contained the several Exceptions Mr. B— makes against my Preface.

1. I said, 'that *J. B.* as many times before Occasionally; so now in a Set Discourse first Preach'd, and afterwards Publish'd, has opposed the Constitution of the Church, as by Law

‘ Law Establish’d. Now Mr. B--- excepts against this Accu-
 sation * in these Words, which I shall recite at large. ‘ And had * *Poster. p. 57.*
 ‘ my Answerers been as conversant in the Writings of the Excel-
 ‘ lent Divines of the Establish’d Church, as might have been
 ‘ expected from Persons so forward to Engage in this Contro-
 ‘ versy ; I believe they would have forbore to charge me so
 ‘ rashly with *Assaulting their Church, and the Order of their Bishops,*
 ‘ *with flying in the Face of my Superiors and the Laws* (as Mr. Dr---
 ‘ speaks) *and with opposing the Constitution of the Establish’d Church* (as
 ‘ Mr. Fr--- expresses it.) And all this for maintaining a *Doctrine*
 ‘ wherein I have the entire Consent and Concurrence of some
 ‘ of the Brightest Lights that ever shone in the Orb of the Eng-
 ‘ lish Church, and who themselves have submitted to *Diocesan E-*
 ‘ *piscopacy* : I might with more Reason charge those Gentlemen
 ‘ with flying in the Face of those Eminent Reformers. I desire
 Mr. E— will excuse me, if I defer the particular Examination
 of all the Authors he has cited ; I dare affirm, that all agree
 with me in the Opinion I deliver’d concerning a *Bishop* *. ‘ That * *Ans. P. 4.*
 ‘ he is a Presbyter, having many Presbyters under him, and ex-
 ‘ exercising over the Presbyters, and the People committed to
 ‘ their Care, Acts of Spiritual Power and Authority (such as
 ‘ Ordination, Confirmation and Excommunication) which
 ‘ mere Presbyters cannot Exercise without him. That these
 Writers are of my Opinion concerning *Bishops*, His Majesty,
 King CHARLES I. says *, ‘ His Majesty presumeth you could * *Second Paper*
 ‘ not be ignorant that all, or most of the Testimonies you recite *to the Ministers*
 ‘ of the Ancient Fathers, Writers of middle Ages, Schoolmen *at Newport,*
 ‘ and Canonists, and the Book Publish’d under King Henry VIII. *conc. the Ages,*
 ‘ do but either import the promiscuous and indifferent Use of *&c. Par. 4.*
 ‘ the Names of Bishops and Presbyters, whereof Advantage
 ‘ ought not to be made to take away the difference of the
 ‘ things, or else they relate to a School Point (which in respect
 ‘ of the thing it self, is but a very Nicety) disputed *Pro and Con*
 ‘ by curious Questionists, *Utrum Episcopatus sit ordo, vel gradus ;*
 ‘ both Sides in the mean time acknowledging the Right of
 ‘ Church-Government to be in the Bishops alone, and not in
 ‘ the Presbyters : As also, that there may be produced either
 ‘ from the same Writers, or from others of as good Authority or
 ‘ Credit, Testimonies both for Number and Clearness, far be-
 ‘ yond those by you mention’d to assert the three different De-
 ‘ grees or Orders (call ’em whether you will) of Ecclesiastical
 ‘ Functions (*viz.* the Bishop, the Presbyter, and Deacon.) *Thus*
 His

* *Introduct. to His Majesty.*
Ans.

And Mr. B— might have observ'd that I used * these Words, Order, Dignity, Degree, Office, indifferently, having resolved to lay aside all the Words, the use of which hath not only render'd the Writings of some Men upon this Subject, intricate and perplexed; but also given occasion of Cavil to our Adversaries. This, I find, is the Case of Mr. B— in his *Postscript*; for upon this Point, which His Majesty calls a very Nicety, disputed Pro and Con by curious Questionists, he spends p. 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56.— Whether my Accusation against Mr. E—, that he has as many times before occasionally, so now lately in a set Discourse, first Preach'd, and afterwards Publish'd, opposed the Constitution of the Establish'd Church, let the Reader judge from the Collection I have lately made and Publish'd out of his Writings.

2. I said, 'That J. B. has transcrib'd from *Smectymnus*, without the least Acknowledgment (in a manner Word for Word) two Pages of his Sermon, which contain an Abstract of the Travels of *Timothy* and *Titus*. In Answer to this, * *Postsc. p. 58.* Mr. B— says *, 'I never in my Life saw *Smectymnus*. (It's a Wonder Mr. B—, who read the *Fuells*, &c. did not see *Smectymnus*, a Book written by a Club of Dissenting Ministers, and * *Postsc. p. 129.* generally known and quoted.) And again *, 'In Truth I never saw *Smectymnus* at all; and took that Abstract, not from *Smectymnus*, but from Mr. Corbet's *Remains*, in his *Treatise concerning Episcopacy*. But be it so. If Mr. B— Transcrib'd from Mr. Corbet, as it seems, Mr. Corbet did from *Smectymnus*; they both should have own'd at first from whence they borrow'd. But after all, Mr. B— is not acquitted, For putting the Name of Corbet instead of *Smectymnus*, My Charge stands good against Mr. B—.

3. I said, 'That J. B. positively affirms *Titus* was sent for by St. Paul to *Nicopolis* the next Year after he was left in *Crete*; and likewise affirms, that all agree he staid but one Year there. To this Mr. B— replies, 'I can see no Probability at all of *Titus* having been ever Six Years in *Crete*. Mr. E— is pleased to differ in Opinion from *Smectymnus*, an Author receiv'd and approv'd by the whole Body of Dissenters: But he never saw *Smectymnus* in his Life; in Truth he never saw him. We will take his Word this time. But he is pleas'd to differ from Mr. Corbet, the Man upon whose Judgment and Authority he depended, and from whom he confesses he took the Abstract. But why does he * *Postsc. p. 129.* differ from Mr. Corbet? He tells us why. * 'I took that Abstract, not from *Smectymnus*, but from Mr. Corbet in his *Treatise concerning*

Mr. J. B---'s Postscript.

7

'concerning Episcopacy; for I can see no Probability at all of *Titus* having been ever six Years in *Crete*. If there be any Reasoning intended by Mr. B— in the Words quoted (and sure Mr. B— does not say any thing without Reasoning) it would seem to me to stand thus. 'I see no Probability that *Titus* was six Years in *Crete*, therefore I took that Abstract from Mr. Corbet. I appeal to the Reader, whether Mr. B— must not here for his own sake bespeak Mr. Fr---'s further Exercise of Patience, as he expresses himself *.

* Postsc. pag. 108.

But why does not Mr. B— acknowledge his Mistake in that Expression so very confident in his Sermon? 'All agree that he [i. e. *Titus*] staid but one Year there. *Smectymnus*, a Book, Mr. P--- says, he in Truth never saw: *Corbet*, a Book, Mr. B--- says, he saw and took this Abstract out of, affirm *Titus* staid there six Years. Nay, many Authors which I mention'd * out of Bishop *Downham*, do affirm that *Titus* died there. Such a confident Affirmation, notwithstanding the Testimonies of so many Authors to the contrary, Mr. B— would have call'd Ignorance or gross Prevarication in another Man.

* Answ. p. 24.

C H A P. III.

Wherein are contained Mr. B—'s Exceptions against the First Section of my Answer.

IN this Section the Question in dispute between US and the DISSENTERS concerning Episcopacy, is stated; and our Opinion concerning it, is deliver'd in Eight Positions.—— Now Mr. B—'s Exceptions in his Postscript (which I think have any Reference to this Section) are levell'd either against the whole Section, or only some parts of it. I shall consider both.

First then, Mr. B—, after his usual way, speaking contemptibly of those two Gentlemen that have undertaken to answer the Sermon, says *, 'I think they should, before they had wrote on this Subject, have form'd to themselves some uniform and consistent Scheme of Principles; whereas their Answers are formed upon two several Hypotheses that are perfectly opposite and inconsistent; and yet they one while make use of the one, and then of the other, to avoid the Force of the few Scriptural Arguments I have used, just as they think will best serve

* Postsc. p. 72.

An Examination of

* *Postsc.* p. 73. 'serve their main Cause: And this I take to be unfair and disingenious. And then * Mr. B--- proceeds to lay down two several ways, that the Asserters of the Divine Right of Episcopacy have taken to defend it. 'The one is, that of Dr. Hammond, who asserts all the Elders and Bishops mention'd in the 'Holy Scripture, to be of that Order that we now call Diocesan Bishops, and invested with all the Power that is now 'claimed by such. The other is that more commonly insisted 'on, that Diocesan Bishops are the Successors, either of the Apostles, or of such as *Timothy* and *Titus*, in the Power that they 'are suppos'd to have claim'd over these Scriptural Elders and 'Bishops. And so Mr. B— pretends to shew many Inconsistencies which his Answerers are guilty of. *Postsc.* p. 73, 74. I shall make some Remarks upon this Passage; and let the Reader judge, whether Mr. B— has any Advantage over one of *those two Gentlemen* (for I shall not concern my self with Mr. Dr—'s Discourse) *that has undertaken to Answer the Sermon.*

* *Postsc.* p. 79. *First Remark.* I find Mr. B— contradicting in this Passage what he has said in other Places of his *Postscript*. Here he says, that Mr. Dr—'s and Mr. Fr—'s 'Answers are formed upon two 'Hypotheses that are perfectly opposite and inconsistent. But we find him afterwards * speaking thus. 'Both my Answerers (but especially Mr. Dr—) seem to insist on this Hypothesis [*i. e.* 'that the Apostles themselves must have Successors in their Apostolical Office, or at least that the Evangelists must have 'such Successors; and that the Diocesan Bishops are Successors 'either of the one or the other.] Now how will Mr. B— reconcile himself to himself here? I think *he is perfectly opposite and inconsistent with himself.* I desire he would let me know how Mr. Dr—'s and Mr. Fr—'s Answers can be formed upon two several Hypotheses, perfectly opposite and inconsistent; and they in the mean time insist upon one Hypothesis. If Mr. B— can reconcile such Contradictions, I confess his Pen is abler than mine.

* *Postsc.* p. 72. *Second Remark is,* That Mr. B— says *, 'I one while make use 'of one Hypothesis, and then of another, to avoid the Force of 'the few plain Scriptural Arguments he has used, just as I think 'will best serve my main Cause; which he takes to be unfair 'and disingenious. And so lays down two Hypotheses, one of which he would confine me unto. In Answer to this I must tell Mr. B—, that in Writing my Method always is, and shall be, to embrace what I can discover to be Truth, and not implicitly to follow any Man's Hypothesis. The only difference between

tween the two Hypotheses here produced by Mr. B—, is whether there were Presbyters in the Apostolick Age, or no. If we suppose there were Presbyters, [as I think there were] the Difference vanishes; and the Result will be, that during the Lives of the Apostles there was a Subordination of Presbyters to Bishops, and of Bishops to the Apostles: But when the Apostles dy'd, the Bishops continued to exercise their Authority over the Presbyters, without any Subordination to others above 'em. This I may say, and not be *unfair* and *disingenious*.

Mr. B—'s *Second Exception*, which may be reduced to this Section, wherein I state the Question between the Dissenters and Us, is *in these Words. 'My Answerers have in my Opinion quite changed the Subject of Debate about *Scriptural Bishops*, into a new one about *Scriptural Apostles*. [And again.] 'That new Controversy which they have raised. I could wish Mr. B— had deliver'd himself in a more clear and intelligible manner; and shew'd what he means by *Scriptural Apostles* and *Scriptural Bishops*. I always took the Subject of Debate between the Dissenters and Us to be, whether we can conclude from Scripture and Ancient Authors, that there were appointed by the Apostles, or that there were from the Times of the Apostles such Persons as we call Bishops; i. e. Such as I have describ'd them to be *; Presbyters or Ministers, having many Presbyters or Ministers under them; and exercising over these Presbyters or Ministers, and the People committed to their Care, Acts of Spiritual Power and Authority (such as Ordination, Confirmation and Excommunication) which mere Presbyters or Ministers cannot exercise alone, and by themselves, without them. This I take to be the Subject of Debate between the Dissenters and us, tho Mr. B— is pleas'd to call it a new Controversy which we have raised. Thus also His Majesty King CHARLES I. states it †: 'Episcopal Government being nothing else, but the Government of the Churches within a certain Precinct (commonly called a Diocese) committed to one single Person, with sufficient Authority over the Presbyters and People of those Churches for that end. Just before, His Majesty explains wherein this sufficient Authority over the Presbyters and People consists in these Words: 'The Bishops challenge no more, or other Power to belong unto them in respect of their Episcopal Offices, as it is distinct from that of Presbyters, than what properly falleth under one of these three, Ordaining, giving Rules, and Censures. Thus His Majesty. And the Ministers themselves attending, speak to this same Purpose †: 'The Bishop

Postsc. p. 43.

Answer. p. 2.

† *Second Paper deliver'd to the Ministers attending at Newport.*

† *Answer to His Majesty's of first Paper.*

An Examination of

‘ of these times (*i. e.* in the first Ages of the Church) was one pre-
 ‘ siding in, and joyning with the Presbytery of his Church;
 ‘ Ruling with them, and not without them. Now let the Rea-
 der judge, whether I have (as Mr. B— alledges) changed the
Subject of the Debate between the Dissenters and Us, concerning E-
 piscopacy : and whether I have raised a new Controversy. Nay,
 so far am I from changing the *Subject of Debate*, that if the Rea-
 der will be pleas’d to compare *Section I.* and *II.* of my *Answer*,
 wherein my Opinion and Mr. B—’s concerning *Episcopacy* are
 deliver’d ; he will find, that we both make the matter of the
 Controversy to be the same with that which is deliver’d in the
 Papers that passed between His Majesty and the Ministers at-
 tending on him. So that I take this Exception of Mr. B— a-
 gainst the State of the Controversy to be (to use his own
 * *Postsc.* p. 73. Words *) *unfair and disingenuous*. Nay, further, I may hence
 conclude, that I have a very just Exception against those Words
 * *Postscr.* p. 82. of Mr. B— * : ‘ Mr. Dr— alone has advanced any thing like a
 ‘ Scheme of Principles, in order to set the Controversy in a
 ‘ true Light, and bring it to some Issue.

I am very glad to find that Mr. B— is pleas’d to think either of
 his *Answerers* have done what he here does appropriate to Mr. Dr—.
 God forbid I should ever be guilty of any Action or Expression,
 which may tend to lessen the Commendation due to any Man.
 Nay, I am glad to find that Mr. B— has given one (for I find
 in his whole *Postscript* no other) Instance of Civility and Re-
 spect to Mr. Dr— : But still I must observe from the Papers of
 His Majesty and the Ministers attending on Him, just now
 mention’d, that I have set (notwithstanding Mr. B—’s Affser-
 tion to the contrary) the *Controversy in a true Light*, so as to bring
 it to some Issue. And I desire Mr. B— would do to me, what
 * *Postsc.* p. 82. he does at least pretend to do to Mr. Dr—, in these Words * :
 ‘ I must freely tell him, that I find the Positions on which he
 : builds this Superstructure of the Divine Right of Episcopacy,
 ‘ to be full of palpable Mistakes, or precarious and unprov’d
 ‘ Affsertions. Let Mr. B— point out any one of the Eight Posi-
 tions I laid down *, which does not tend to set this Controversy in
 * *Ans.* Sect. 2. a true Light ; and I’ll shew him the contrary : Or let him pro-
 duce any one Position in *Section 2* *, wherein I have misrepres-
 * *Vid.* *Ans.* w. ented his Opinion. These two *Sections* were written with a
 design to set this Controversy in a true Light ; and I desire Mr. B—
 would shew me, wherein I have fail’d of performing what I
 thus design’d.

Mr. J. B---'s Postscript.

II

3. Mr. B— hath offer'd something * concerning Ordination * *Postsc. p. 81.*
and Confirmation, which may seem to be Exceptions against *91, 92, 109.*
the Positions I laid down *, in order to *set the Controversy in a* * *Answ. Sect. 1.*
true Light ; but if it be duly consider'd, it will be found otherwise.
Mr. B— there speaks only against those that so *appropriate these*
Acts of Power to Diocesan Bishops, as to declare that Presbyters
have receiv'd no Power to perform 'em : For his Words are, ' If
' they do appropriate these Acts to Diocesan Bishops, and de-
' clare (as Mr. Dr— does) that Presbyters have receiv'd no
' Power to perform them. *As Mr. Dr— does,* Mr. Fr— does
not therefore *appropriate these Acts* ; and this indeed is evident,
for I * do allow, that in Ordination of Ministers, and other * *Answ. Sect.*
Acts of Power and Authority Ecclesiastical, the Presbyters of *1. Numb. 8.*
single Congregations may, or ought to concur and be concern'd.
Nay, Mr. B— does expressly own this to be my Opinion ; for
in arguing against Mr. Dr— *, in order to shew his Disagree- * *Postsc. p. 90.*
ment with me, he produces these Words of mine, or rather re-
fers to 'em. ' We allow the Elders to be their Assistants, and as
' such concern'd in both Church-Government and Ordination.

And here I must take leave to recite some Words of Mr. B— *. * *Postsc. p. 81.*
' I would therefore advise these Gentlemen to digest their No-
' tions of these things more maturely : For if they do not *appre-*
' *priate these Acts* of Ordination, Censuring, &c. to Diocesan
' Bishops, they must no longer pretend them to be a distinct and
' Superior Order, which yet is the main Assertion they under-
' take to prove and defend. It is very strange that Mr. B— will
undertake to word my Thoughts for me, and bring me in as u-
sing Terms and Expressions which I * industriously avoided to * *Answ. Introd.*
take away all occasion of Cavil. Without Mr. B—'s Advice I did digest
my Notions of these things very maturely, and found it the most pru-
dent way to use the Words Order, Office, Dignity, Degree, indiffe-
rently ; or rather laying 'em aside, to deliver my Opinion of a
Bishop in plain easie Terms, as I did *. The Reader may here * *Answ. p. 2. 5.*
observe, and is here desired to take Notice, that tho I do not
appropriate Acts of Ordination, Censuring, &c. to Diocesan Bi-
shops, but allow the Presbyters to be their Assistants, and as
such concern'd in these Acts ; yet I am entirely against all Pa-
rity and Equality of Ministers in Power, which the Presbyteri-
ans (and particularly Mr. B—) do affirm.

C H A P. IV.

Wherein Mr. B—'s Exceptions are contained, which he offers against the Arguments I laid down (in the 3d Section of my Answer) to prove and establish our Opinion.

I Shall here propose my Arguments in the same Order which I observ'd in my *Answer*; and so passing over the Cases of *St. James*, and *Timothy* and *Titus*, because I shall consider them hereafter. I come to the

Second Argument I laid down, drawn from the *Angels* mentioned by *St. John*, *Rev. Ch. II. and III.* And here,

* *Postsc.* pag.
141.

1st. *Mr. B—* is pleas'd to say *, 'that this Argument is barely propos'd by me; whereas if the Reader be pleas'd to consider the place, he will find I prove these *Angels* to be Bishops from the Direction of *St. John*, who constantly represents them to be *single Persons*; and from the Commendation or Censure he passes upon them, according as they behaved themselves in their respective Charges; and then conclude, that *this is a good Scriptural Argument for our Opinion, unless J. B. will shew, that a Presbytery may be called an Angel; nay, is so called in Scripture.* Nay, I do not find that *Mr. B—* takes notice of any other Arguments different from what I offer'd, in *Mr. Dr—*; so little reason has *Mr. B---* to say, 'The same Argument is barely propos'd by *Mr. Fr---*. — But to proceed: We will consider what *Mr. B---* has offer'd against these several Arguments, to prove, that the Word *Angel* is to be taken *collectively*, and not for a single Person, as we do affirm. — And here he offers two Arguments.

* *Rev. 14. 6,*
7, 8, 9.

1st. 'In this very Book (he saith) the Word *Angel* is to be taken *collectively* *, for the whole Body of those Faithful Pastors, that adhere to the Purity of the Christian Religion, in opposition to *Pagano-papal Idolatry*. This *Mr. B---* affirms without any Proof, whereas *Marlorat* (who has with great Fidelity collected the Interpretations of the Reformed Divines upon the New Testament) tells us *, that *St. John* in that place speaks of particular Persons, whom God did successively raise up in his Church, as the Exigencies of it requir'd. *Angelus iste quemlibet fidum Evangelij praeconem significat, &c.* This same *Marlorat* * explains those Words, *Unto the Angel of the Church of Ephesus*, thus:

* *In loc.*

* *On Ch. 2. v. 1.*

Non

Non Populum aggreditur, sed Clerum, nec quemlibet de Clero nominatim compellat, sed principem Cleri, utiq; Episcopum. And afterwards again, speaking of the Angel of the Church of Smyrna, he tells us * : *Hujus Ecclesiae beatus Polycarpus Episcopus fuisse creditur.* * *Vers. 8.*

A 2d Argument whereby Mr. B--- would prove that *Angel* must be here taken *collectively*, and not *personally*, is drawn from *Psal. XXXIV. 7.* *The Angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them.* Mr. B--- cannot be ignorant that many Criticks * take *Angel of the Lord* in this Psalm, *personally* for one *Angel*, or for *Michael the Arch-Angel*, or for the *Son of God*. * *Pool's Synopsis Criticorum.* Nay, supposing that *Angel of the Lord* in this Psalm should signify *collectively*, I see no reason Mr. B--- should therefore conclude it signifies so in the *Revelations*; unless he could prove that the Text, or Context, did justify such a Signification; which is the Rule that *Flaccus Illyricus* lays down * for the right Interpretation of the Sense of this Word. * *In voc. Angelus.*

Mr. B--- having thus, thô upon very weak and insufficient Grounds, establish'd his Opinion, that *Angel* must be taken *collectively* in the Passages cited out of the *Revelations*, proceeds to deliver the several ways, which Expositors have accordingly followed in explaining it: Some hereby understand the whole Church it self, including both Pastors and People: Others again, the Pastors and Teachers that were placed in these several Churches. Now Mr. B--- might have sav'd himself the trouble of producing these Expositions, had he duly consider'd what we understand when we call these *Angels* single Persons: For his Information I'll recite Dr. Hammond's Words, as they are found in his *Annotations* *. 'Now because these Angels are so considerable parts in the Churches, therefore it is that the Messages which are sent to the whole Congregation of Christian Professors under them, are hereby address'd particularly to the Angels, c. 2. 1. and so in the rest; where, thô the Angels were single Persons, yet what is said to them, is not said only to their Persons, but to the Universality of the People under them, whose Non-proficiency, or Remission of Degrees of Christian Virtue, especially their falling off from the Constancy and Courage of their Profession do deserve (and are accordingly threatned with) the Removal of that Christian Knowledge, that Grace, those Priviledges of a Church which had been allow'd them, c. 2. 5. which is not so properly applicable as a Punishment of the Bishop, as of the People under him. Unless then, Mr. B--- does prove, that in these Churches, and

* *On Rev. Ch. I. v. 20.*

An Examination of

and among their several Pastors there was not some one Person who presided over them, and perform'd the Office of a Bishop (notwithstanding the Expositions he has brought) he has prov'd nothing against our Opinion, that these Churches of *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, &c. were govern'd by Bishops, who are here principally intended by the *Angels* of the Churches.

I cannot here but observe a Mistake Mr. B--- has run into, in saying, that St. *Austin* seems to approve the Exposition of *Ticonius*, which he mentions *Lib. 3. c. 30. De Doctrinâ Christianâ*. It is evident to every one that reads that Passage, that St. *Austine* gives a very bad Character of *Ticonius*, calling him a *Donatist*, and produces this his Exposition only as a plain Argument of the Imperfection of the *Seven Rules*; whereby *Ticonius* pretended to explain whatever occurs in Scripture, but does not say one Word by way of Commendation of it.

* *Possscr. pag. 144.* But 3^{dly}, Mr. B--- tells us *, that 'tho we should understand 'the *Angel* of each Church, of a *single Person*; it will by no 'means prove him to be a Diocesan Bishop. And this Mr. B--- proves from Mr. *Basnage*, an Authority which (in my Answer I shew'd) was directly contradicted by the Learned *Selden*. Mr. B--- being sensible of this, and the great Advantage I have thereby, does by way of Confirmation now add the Testimonies of Dr. *Lightfoot* and Dr. *Stillingsfleet*. And because Mr. B--- does lay so great a stress upon the Authority of this Mr. *Basnage*, I shall particularly consider what he says, and see whether any thing is prov'd, or can be prov'd, out of Mr. *Basnage* against my Opinion concerning a Bishop, who (as the Reader may remember) is describ'd by me to be a *Presbyter*, that has, or may have, other *Presbyters* under him; over whom he exercises a Power, which these *Presbyters* themselves without him cannot exercise.

* *Possscr. p. 145.* 1st, Then, Mr. *Basnage* tells us, as Mr. B--- rightly observes *, 'That 'the *Jews* had a Bishop, or Inspector, who is called the *Angel* of 'the Assembly; who took care that the Service of God was not neglected: He presided over the Reading and the Performing all other Ceremonies. But now Dr. *Lightfoot* (who, according to Mr. 'E---, concurs with Mr. *Basnage* in Judgment upon this matter) gives us a fuller Account, and indeed such a one, as very much confirms our Opinion: For Dr. *Lightfoot* tells us, *Vol. II. 133.* the very Place quoted by Mr. B---, that 'this *Angel* of the Church, 'or Bishop of the Congregation, sometimes Preach'd, if there 'were not some other to discharge this Office. This publick 'Minister of the Synagogue himself Read not the Law publick-ly

ly; but every Sabbath he call'd out Seven of the Synagogue (on other Days fewer) whom he judg'd fit to Read. He stood by him that Read, with great Care observing that he Read nothing either falsely or improperly; and calling him, and correcting him if he fail'd in any thing: And hence he is call'd *ἐπισκοπος*, or Overseer.

Now this Account of Dr. Lightfoot concerning the Angel of the Church, the Bishop of the Congregation, makes his Office to be of great Affinity with that of a Bishop in my Sense and Opinion: For a Bishop, tho' he himself does not Read the Law publicly, i. e. to speak in our Modern Way, tho' he does not perform in Person the several Acts of the Ministerial Function in the Publick Worship of God, yet he provides able Men to do it. As the Angel of the Church sometimes Preach'd, if there were not some other to discharge this Office; so I hope it will not be deny'd, but that our Bishops do at least thus much. As the Angel of the Church stood by him that Read, with great Care observing that he Read nothing either falsely or improperly; and calling him back, and correcting him if he had fail'd in any thing: So do our Bishops inspect the Behaviour of Ministers and Presbyters in the Discharge of their Duty, and correct them if they are guilty of any Neglect or Omission. Nay, which also does very much confirm what I have here offer'd concerning the Affinity between the Government of the Jewish Synagogue, and that of our Church; Dr. Lightfoot tells us, 'There were also three Deacons, or Almoners, whom they call'd *Parnasim*. So that according to Dr. Lightfoot's Account, we have from the Jewish Synagogue a Pattern or Example of the several Offices of our Church: The Angel of the Church, who inspected the Behaviour of the Persons chosen out of the Synagogue to Read the Law publicly, and censured their Neglects, represents our Bishop: The Persons chosen to Read the Law Publickly, and subject to the Angel of the Synagogue, represent our Presbyters; and our Deacons are like the *Parnasim*, on whom was the Care of the Poor. After all which, I think, I may with good Reason subjoin even Mr. Basnage's own Words * : *Postsc. P. 145.*

'For this Reason St. John in his Revelation censures the Angel of Thyatira and the Angel of Smyrna, because those Bishops had neglected their Duty. The Bishops of these Churches having neglected to censure and correct the Pastors, or People under them, for their Faults and Miscarriages; are here themselves censur'd, as the Angel of the Assembly, according to Mr. Basnage; the publick Minister of the Synagogue, or Bishop of the Congregation, according

An Examination of

according to Dr. *Lightfoot*, ought to have been censur'd, in case neglected to have corrected the Person who *Read either falsely or improperly in the Synagogue*.

But further, Mr. *Basnage* himself concurs with Dr. *Lightfoot* in allowing, that * There were one or two Persons set over the Doctors, who regulated the Synagogue in our Saviour's time. From all which it appears, that if we judge of Church-Government from the *Jewish Synagogues*, there were Persons who acted in Subordination to others.

* *Hist. of the Jews, Book 5. p. 408.*

But Mr. E— may say out of Mr. *Basnage*, ' That there was no difference put between *Bishops* and *Priests*, but that of *Presidency*, which was given to Age and Merit ; and therefore the Names of *Bishops* and *Priests* are so often confounded in the Gospel, as well as among the *Jews*. All the Doctors that took care of the Synagogue were of the same Order, and held the same Rank. For the truth of this Assertion Mr. *Basnage* produces the Testimony of *Vitringa* *. It will therefore be proper to set down *Vitringa's* Opinion concerning this Matter, as I find it in several parts of his Writings. I must confess, that *Vitringa* seems to me to write very doubtfully, and not with that Consistency which might be expected. Sometimes he allows Mr. *Dodwell* (for in this place he mentions him, and his *Dissert. Cyp.*) that *Bishops* are a distinct Order from the *Presbyters* ; sometimes he denies it : But still *Vitringa* confirms my Opinion, and positively affirms, there were such Persons as I have all along described *Bishops* to be. — (As to the Words *Order, Office, &c.* I must desire the Reader again to observe, that I use 'em indifferently, and without any Distinction.) For the Satisfaction of my Reader, and particularly Mr. E—, I shall set down *Vitringa's* Opinion in his own Words. *Lib. III. Par. I. p. 847, &c.*

* *Vid. Basnage in loc.*

1. *Extra controversiam pono, Scriptores Ecclesiasticos secundi & tertij Seculi, &c. i. e.* ' I put it beyond all Controversy, that the Ecclesiastical Writers of the second and third Century, tho' they frequently make the *Bishops* and *Presbyters* to be of the same Order, do yet distinguish 'em into different Orders.

2. *Concedo viro Docto, inde quod Episcopi aliquando cum Presbyteris, &c. i. e.* ' I allow this Learned Man (meaning Mr. *Dodwell*) that it does not follow, because *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, when jointly oppos'd to *Deacons*, are said to be of the same Order, that therefore they are not of a different Order if they be refer'd to each other, and if the *Bishops* are consider'd with respect to the *Presbyters*.

3. *Non nego etiam, Episcopos à veteribus comparari cum Sacerdote summo. i. e.* I do not also deny, that Bishops are compar'd by the Ancients to the High-Priest, and Presbyters to the rest of the Priests. — From which Passages the Reader may observe, that Vitringa himself (upon whose Authority and Judgment Mr. Basnage, as also Mr. B—, depend) allows, that Bishops are in some Sense a distinct Order from Presbyters. And indeed, Vitringa judges this to be a mere Logomachia, or Dispute about Terms; and therefore, in order to accommodate the Dispute, he delivers his Opinion thus *.

Ibid. p. 850.

4. *Nos, qui prius rati Episcoporum & Presbyterorum defendimus non negamus tamen, &c. i. e.* We, who maintain Bishops and Presbyters to be of the same Order, do yet not deny, that the Presbyteries, or COLLEGES OF PRESBYTERS, IN THE AGE OF THE APOSTLES HAD THEIR PERPETUAL PRESIDENTS, UPON WHOM THE CHIEF CARE OF THE GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS DEVOLVED: And what would the Patrons of the contrary Opinion demand more? [And again.] *Illos Presbyteriorum Præsides, &c. i. e.* THOSE PRESIDENTS OF THE COLLEGE OF PRESBYTERS WERE [when the Church was but young] CALLED BISHOPS, which we do affirm. [And again *] *Antiquissimis temporibus quisq; promotus Doctor, aut Presbyter, &c. i. e.* In the most Ancient times every Person that was advanced to the Dignity of a Doctor, or Presbyter, did also advance others: But when the Honour of a Doctor's Degree, through the abundance of Persons advanc'd to it, grew cheap and vile, it was order'd otherwise; so that it would not be contrary to the Rules of the Christian Church, as it was settled in the Beginning, for every Presbyter to ordain Presbyters with the Consent of the People: But lest by indulging a Power of ordaining to all Presbyters indifferently, and without any Exception, the Numbers of Presbyters should too much increase, and the Honour of their Office should grow cheap and vile, THE EXERCISE OF THIS POWER WAS ONLY COMMITTED TO THE PRESIDENTS, OR BISHOPS ALONE, ACCORDING TO THE MANNER AND CUSTOM AT THE SAME TIME RECEIV'D AMONG THE JEWS. [And again * Vitringa Lib. 2. cap. 2. tells us, speaking against Lay-Elders.] *Ecclesiae post tempora Apostolorum (quantum de iis ex antiquis Monumentis judicare licet) quos habuerunt, &c. i. e.* What sort of Presbyters does Antiquity inform us, that the Churches had after the Times of the Apostles? What

Pag. 851.

Lib. 2. cap. 2. p. 486.

An Examination of

‘What Form and Manner of Government had those Churches?
 ‘IT’S PLAIN, NOTHING CAN BE MORE CERTAIN,
 ‘NOTHING MORE MANIFESTLY TRUE IN ALL AN-
 ‘TIQUITY, THAN THIS, THAT PRESBYTERS, AS DI-
 ‘STINCT FROM THE BISHOP SO CALLED, MADE
 ‘UP THE MOST CONSIDERABLE PART OF THE
 ‘CLERGY. [And again immediately afterwards.] *Presbyteros*
habuisse facultatem Baptizatos, absente Episcopo. i. e. ‘That the Pres-
 ‘byters had Power of anointing the Foreheads of Persons bap-
 ‘tized in the Absence of the Bishop. [And again in the same
 Place.] *Episcopus, ut Presbyterorum princeps ab aliis Episcopis. i. e.* ‘The
 ‘Bishop, as Prince or Chief of the Presbyters, was commonly
 ‘ordained and confirmed by many other Bishops; whereas a
 ‘PRESBYTER COULD BE ORDAINED BY EVEN ONE
 ‘BISHOP.

* L. 8. 3, par.
 1. p. 851.

The Summ then (as appears from these several Passages) of
Vitringa’s Opinion is this, That amongst the *Jews*, tho’ the Pre-
 sident of the Presbytery was of the same Order with the rest of
 the Presbyters, ‘concerning which (says *Vitringa* *) some Doubt
 ‘may very well be made; yet his Office was perpetual, and no
 one could be promoted, or ordained, without his License; and
 therefore the President was distinguished from them so promo-
 ted. And now, I think, I may with good Reason appeal to
 the Judgment of Mr. B— himself, whether this *Vitringa*, upon
 whom Mr. *Basnage* (and consequently Mr. B—) grounds his O-
 pinion, does not confirm what I have said concerning the Order,
 or Office, or Dignity of a Bishop in my Answer; wherein I affirm a
 Bishop to be so distinct from his Presbyters, tho’ he be a Presby-
 ter himself, that they cannot in all respects be said to be equal.

So much for Mr. B—’s Exception against my first Argument,
 drawn from the *Angels* mentioned by St. John in the Revelations.

* Answ. p. 7.

* Post. p. 154.

THE SECOND ARGUMENT I us’d to prove an *Episcopal*
 Government, was * drawn from an uninterrupted Continuance
 of such a Government, without Opposition from any one Per-
 son for many Years after the Apostles, even not till the fourth
 Century, when *Aerius* oppos’d it. Mr. B— in his Exceptions a-
 gainst this Argument * has not shew’d, that any one Person be-
 fore *Aerius*, did oppose Episcopacy, which yet he ought to
 have done, if he would have given a direct Answer to it. Nay, he
 owns, Episcopacy did not meet with any Opposition, because
 ‘it was brought on by several gradual Steps, that were almost
 ‘insensible and imperceptible. But why did not Mr. B— prove
 this?

this? And whereas Mr. B--- says, that I make *Aerius's* Opinion an *Heresy*; the Reader may easily see that this is a plain Mistake, for I only say*, 'That St. *Epiphanius* and St. *Austin* declare *Aerius's* Opinion to be altogether new, nay, extravagantly mad, which I prov'd out of their Writings. But suppose I had call'd *Aerius* an *Heretick* upon this Account, Mr. B--- may read that Dr. *Barrow* is of that Opinion *. 'Hence was *Aerius* accounted * *Ans. p. 48.*
'a *Heretick*, for meaning to innovate in so grand a point of Discipline as the Subordination of Bishops and Presbyters. * *Unity of the Church, p. 285.*

But Mr. B---, to invalidate the Testimony of St. *Epiphanius* in this Case, tells us *: 'And by the way, if they will, upon *Epiphanius's* Authority, make his Opinion an *Heresy*; they must, upon the same Authority, make it an *Heresy* to deny the Warrantableness of Prayers for the Dead; for that is also a part of the formidable Charge of *Heresy* that *Epiphanius* advances against *Aerius*. * *Postsc. p. 154.*

Had Mr. B--- duly consider'd the Passages of *Epiphanius*, wherein he delivers *Aerius's* Opinions, and argues against 'em; he would have found that *Aerius* is there accused because he disallows all sorts of Commendations of the Saints, and thinks that Prayers for them are not warrantable upon any Account, and in any Sense. Whereas *Epiphanius* shews, that for many Reasons, there may be an Honourable Commemoration of the Saints; and that Prayers may be offer'd for them. Not that this Passage of *Epiphanius* does in any respect countenance the Opinion of the Church of *Rome*, as some pretend; for *Chamier* has demonstrated the contrary beyond all Exception, in his *Panstrat*, Tom. 3. p. 1237.

THE THIRD ARGUMENT I used, was taken from the Succession of the Bishops to the Apostles*; and here I find * *Ans. p. 9.*
Mr. B--- mistaken.

1st. In making me to affirm what I never did affirm, that the Bishops were Successors to the Apostles in the Plenitude of their Ecclesiastical Power*: Whereas Mr. B--- himself explains my Opinion otherwise in this Point*, and appropriates this Assertion * *Postsc. p. 79.*
to Mr. Dr---*. May I not therefore apply these Words of * *Postsc. p. 87.*
Mr. B--- to himself? 'I must advise him to read more carefully * *Postsc. p. 83.*
'before he pretends to affirm, and then he would never have
'run into so gross a Mistake, as to imagine that I think that the Bishops are Successors to the Apostles in the Plenitude of their Ecclesiastical Power. I only understand this of the Bishops being Successors to the Apostles in a large Sense, as Dr. *Barrow* him-

self does in these very Words, which Mr. B--- quotes out of
 * *Postsc.* p. 87. him. * 'The Fathers in a large Sense call all Bishops *Successors*
 ' of the Apostles ; not meaning that any of them did succeed
 ' into the whole Apostolical Office, but that each did receive
 ' his Power from some one (immediately or mediately) whom
 ' some Apostles did constitute Bishop ; vesting him with Autho-
 ' rity to feed the particular Flock committed to him in way of
 * *Barrow Pope's* ' ordinary Charge *. And when I expressed my self in general
 * *Supr.* p. 75. Terms, why was not Mr. B--- so candid and kind, as to under-
 stand me in this Sense, rather than make me say what I never
 said, That Bishops are Successors to the Apostles in the Plenitude
 of their Ecclesiastical Power. But further, Dr. Barrow does not on-
 ly not affirm any thing contrary to what I have affirmed, but he
 also confirms this his Opinion [that Bishops are in a large Sense
 Successors to the Apostles] from the very Passage I cited out of Ire-
 * *See Answ.* *næus* to the same Purpose, viz. *Habemus annumerare eos* *. For
 P. 2, Dr. Barrow having said, that the Bishops are called Successors of the A-
 postles, proceeds thus : Which cannot otherwise be understood, than
 according to the Sense which we have propos'd ; that is, ' because they
 ' succeeded those who were constituted by the Apostles, ac-
 ' cording to that Saying of *Irenæus*. ' We can number those who
 * *Pope's Supr.* ' were instituted Bishops by the Apostles, and their Successors *.

But notwithstanding the Interpretation Dr. Barrow has given
 us of this Passage of *Irenæus*, who concludes from it, that the
 Bishops are the Successors of the Apostles, Mr. B— is pleas'd to
 affirm that the Testimony of *Irenæus* is rather against me, than
 for me. He expressly affirms, that according to *Irenæus*, Presby-
 ters are the Successors of the Apostles : Nay further, that (as
 Chamier has observ'd) in *Irenæus*, ' Presbyters are never distin-
 ' guish'd from Bishops, and much less separated from them. So
 * *Postsc.* p. 87. confident is Mr. B— of this, that he tells me *, ' It's strange
 ' that that Gentleman should, if he had read *Irenæus*, over-look
 ' all those Passages, wherein he does expressly affirm Presbyters
 ' to be Successors of the Apostles. And so Mr. B— produces se-
 veral Passages out of that Father to this Purpose. Now by way
 of Answer to Mr. B—, and to convince him that I have read *I-*
renæus,

2dly. I refer him to *Irenæus*, Lib. 3. cap. 14. where he will find,
 (Notwithstanding what Chamier has said) that there is a plain Dif-
 ference made between Bishops and Presbyters. In *Mileto Convo-*
catis Episcopis & Presbyteris. ' Bishops (says *Irenæus*) and Presby-

ters , not Bishops or Presbyters. Which Passage of *Irenæus* is
 so.

so convincing, that Mr. Corbet (Mr. B---'s Friend, from whom he borrow'd the Abstract of *Timothy* and *Titus's Travels*) does not know how to get over it, and chuses rather to give a poor weak Answer, than none at all to it: For having endeavour'd to prove, that with *Irenæus*, Presbyters are the same with Bishops, and Successors of the Apostles, he tells us: 'Admitting what this Father saith hereof (i. e. of Bishops and Presbyters being met at *Miletus*) observe we, that he speaks of Bishops and Presbyters as Congregated in the Meeting, and he might mention two Names of the same Office. This is plainly to beg the Question. Nor do I see any reason why the same Office should be call'd by two Names, because several Persons are met together.

By the way, I cannot but observe one great Instance of Mr. B---'s Partiality with respect to *Chamier*, whose Testimony he so very much insists upon. It's true, *Chamier* does affirm that in *Irenæus*. 'Presbyters are never distinguish'd from Bishops, and much less separated from them. (Which yet I have already shew'd is a Mistake.) But then this same *Chamier*, in the very Chapter-quoted by Mr. B---, does allow * that from the Passage which I cited out of *Irenæus* *. *Habemus annumerare, &c.* It may be concluded, that 'the Inequality between Bishops and Presbyters is most Ancient, and derived from the Time immediately after the Apostles. The Passage of *Chamier* is very remarkable, and therefore I shall recite it at large. *Horum [i. e. Ignatij, Clementij, Dionysij Areopagi, Irenæi, Tertulliani,] Autoritates non ostendunt, &c. i. e.* The Authorities of these Fathers of the Church do not shew, that there never was a time when Bishops were equal to Presbyters; but only that an Inequality between 'em is most Ancient, and derived from the time immediately after the Apostles, which we do freely confess. For *Jerome*, when he tells us that this Inequality prevail'd among the *Alexandrians* in the Times of *Heracles* and *Dionysius*, does plainly teach us, that it was most Ancient; for they lived about the Year 140, or a little while after it, and yet this is the Church that did last of all receive this Innovation; which therefore we may conclude was made before the end of the first Century, or immediately afterwards. *Ignatius* lived to the end of the first Century, was kill'd in the 11th Year of *Trajan*, according to *Baronius*, and in the 110th of Christ: *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* lived not very long after him. Now I appeal to the Reader, whether this Testimony of *Chamier*

Ancient Episcopacy, p. 114.

Panstr. Tom. 2. lib. 10. c. 6. Answ. p. 9.

An Examination of

mier is not very full and evident to our purpose ; and yet Mr. F— (if ever he read the Chapter of Chamier, which he quotes) hath over-look'd it. This I think is strange, and is an undeniable Argument of great Partiality in him.

3. Those very Passages produced by Mr. B— out of Irenæus, to prove that Presbyters are Successors to the Apostles, I find upon Examination must be understood, not of Presbyters strictly so called, but Bishops, for Example. That Passage quoted by * *Postsc.* p. 87. Mr. B— * out of *Lib. 2. c. 2.* *Traditionem quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per Successiones Presbyterorum in Ecclesijs custoditur, Irenæus* himself in the next Chapter explains thus : *Traditionem per Successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usq; ad nos.* Now it's plain, that *Presbyterorum* and *Episcoporum* in these two Places of Irenæus, must signify the same thing ; and that Irenæus himself was a Presbyter and Episcopus, and does derive the Tradition by Succession down to himself [*usq; ad nos.*] So that since all Persons allow that Irenæus was a Bishop in our Sense, the Passage which he here relates must be understood of such Bishops ; and therefore these only are according to Irenæus the Successors of the Apostles.

* *Lib. 4. c. 42.* Again, that other Passage out of Irenæus *. *Qua propter iis qui in Ecclesia sunt, Presbyteris obedire oportet, his qui Successionem habent*

* *Postsc.* p. 87. *ab Apostolis. i. e.* in Mr. B—'s Translation *, 'Let us hearken to the Presbyters who are in the Church, and who have their Succession from the Apostles. If Mr. B— allows there ought to be the Conjunction Copulative [*&*] in the Passage of Irenæus, as indeed in his Translation he does, then he has not Translated it right, for it must be thus. 'Let us hearken to [*iis*] those Presbyters which are in the Church, and [*his*] these, *i. e.* the Bishops, who have Succession from the Apostles. Which Interpretation is indeed very much confirmed by the Words immediately following. *Sicut ostendimus, qui cum Episcopatus Successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum patris acceperunt.* So little reason there is for that insulting Language of Mr. B— * :

* *Postsc.* p. 87. And now Mr. Fr— may see what he will make of his Argument : Irenæus asserts the Bishops to be the Apostles Successors, [*This is allow'd.*] 'so does he assert Presbyters to be their Successors. [*This is a Mistake, and I desire Mr. B— would give some other Proof of it.*] — But because Mr. B— may say, 'Tis wholly Mr. Fr—'s precarious Assertion ; I refer him to the Annotations upon that Passage of Irenæus's Letter *ad Victorem*

* *Irenæi varia Papam†. Presbyteri ante Sotterem.* Upon which the Annotations
Fen Ardentium. p. 513. are

are *. *Cum Presbyteros appellat Romanos Pontifices, non negat illos esse* * Ibid. p. 514.
veré Episcopos, sed tantum indicat omnes quidem Episcopos esse Presbyteros,
sed non e contrario, &c. i. e. When he calls the Bishops of Rome
 Presbyters, he does not deny that they were really Bishops;
 but only intimates that all Bishops are Presbyters, but all
 Presbyters are not Bishops. For it's evident from Scripture,
 and the Decrees of Councils, that Bishops are Superior to
 mere Presbyters, both in Order and Jurisdiction: The con-
 trary Opinion is the Heresy of the *Aerians* and *Waldenses*, which
 the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* in this Age do endeavour to re-
 vive.

CHAP. V.

Wherein are contained several things in the Third Section of
 my Answer, to which Mr. B— hath given no Reply.

1. **M**R. B— is pleas'd to give no Answer to the Testimo-
 nies of St. Irenæus and St. Jerome, which are offer'd in
 the Behalf of Episcopacy.

2. Nor does he shew (as I desired) the time when [upon
 their Supposition, that presently after the Apostles Times the
 Church was govern'd by a Presbytery] such a Change and Al-
 teration as the Presbyterians pretend Episcopacy is, was intro-
 duced, and the possibility of such a Change and Alteration.

3. Nor has he prov'd, what I observ'd, he so confidently af-
 firm'd without any Proof, in his Sermon, that 'Ignatius's Bishop
 was only the Senior Pastor of a particular Flock or Congre-
 gation, which he govern'd in Conjunction with the rest of the
 Elders of it.

4. Nor has he given a particular and distinct Answer to
 Mr. Chillingworth's Demonstration; tho he is pleas'd at the same
 time to affirm, * *It stands upon a lame Foot*; he only tells us, 'It * *Postf. p. 156.*
 is fully refuted by Mr. Lauder, in his *Ancient Bishops consider'd*.
 A Book which, after the most strict Enquiry, I cannot find.

C H A P. VI.

Wherein are contained Mr. B—'s Exceptions against what I have offer'd in the Fourth Section of my Answer against his Arguments from Scripture.

First Exception is this, That I endeavour to prove, that the Apostle St. Paul did not actually reach *Jerusalem* before the Day of *Pentecost*, which Mr. B— says, ' signifies nothing to the Argument. Certainly Bp. Pearson and Dr. Maurice were of another Opinion, and therefore it being a Point very material, whether St. Paul was at *Jerusalem* by the Day of *Pentecost*, or no; they thought it necessary to prove he was not, which indeed they have fully and plainly demonstrated to the Satisfaction of all unprejudic'd Readers, tho' Mr. B— seems to undervalue their Performance, and tells us *: ' They have taken some Pains to ' render it probable. But why did Mr. B— quite over-look the express Testimony of St. Chrysostome produced by me to this very Purpose, and which concurs with the Judgment of the above-mention'd Authors? Methinks he might have had some Regard for the Judgment of that Father of the Church, and not have pass'd his Testimony over without some Notice. But besides the Judgment of Bp. Pearson and Dr. Maurice, that it signifies very much to the Argument, whether St. Paul was at *Jerusalem* by the Day of *Pentecost*, Mr. B— himself (tho' he has now chang'd his Opinion) seems to have been of the same Opinion formerly from the manner of the Argument, whereby he endeavours to prove, that St. Paul did not send for the Bishops of *Asia* to *Miletus*. For he thus states his Argument. ' St. Paul's Haste in going to *Jerusalem* would not permit the sending to all the Parts ' of *Asia*, to gather together so many Bishops, in the Modern ' Sense, to meet him at *Miletus* *. Now does not Mr. B— here suppose that St. Paul, if he did not reach *Jerusalem* by the Day of *Pentecost*, did at least endeavour it, and to that end left *Miletus*; whereas it is evident he was not at *Jerusalem* by the Day of *Pentecost*. Nay, it does not appear that he left *Miletus*; but we have reason rather to conclude, that he staid there till he had gather'd the Bishops. And Irenæus, in the Passage I cited, tells us so expressly.

* *Postsc.* p. 75.

* *Serm.* p. 409.

But to pass this over, our Argument that these were Bishops of *Asia*, will hold as good if St. Paul, when at *Miletus*, had a Prospect of reaching *Jerusalem*, and so went away in haste, as if he actually got thither by the time propos'd; because, as I argued *, ' these several Bishops of *Asia* might upon an Intimation * *Ans. p. 17.*
' given a considerable time before by Letter, or by some other
' way, have met at *Ephesus*, and there waited for the Apostle;
' but now being sent for to *Miletus*, might immediately have
' gone to him. And so I proceed to Mr. B—'s

2d Exception, Which is against the Testimony of St. *Irenæus*, who tells us expressly, that St. Paul did ' call together the several
' Bishops and Presbyters, who came from *Ephesus* and the Neigh-
' bouring Cities; which plainly shews that they were sent for
' by St. Paul, and did accordingly come. Now to this Mr. B—
replies that it is a bare Assertion of *Irenæus* at a great Distance of
Time and Place, and one of the mistaken Matters of Fact, that *Ire-*
næus had taken up on uncertain Tradition. — I shew'd in my
Answer, that *Irenæus* had very particular Advantages and Oppor-
tunities of knowing the Truth of what he related, having con-
versed with *Polycarp* and several of the Apostles Scholars. Be-
sides, *Tertullian* calls him *, ' The most curious Searcher into all * *Adv. Valent.*
' kinds of Doctrines. Add to this as a very confirming Circum- *cap. 5. p. 252.*
stance of the Sincerity of this Father, his Solemn Obtestation to the
Transcriber of his Writings, as St. *Jerome* relates it *. ' I adjure * *Vita Irenæi.*
' you that Transcribe this Book, that you compare it after you
' have Transcrib'd it, and correct it according to the Original,
' out of which you have written it, with all Diligence. Now,
methinks a Person of this Character ought to have been treated
by Mr. B— with greater Deference and Respect, and not have
been represented as one who delivers ' mistaken Matters of Fact
' upon uncertain Tradition. But I find Mr. B— can insist upon
the Authority of *Irenæus* when it seems to be for his Purpose,
and discredit every thing offer'd by this Father of the Church
when against him.

But Mr. B— says *, ' It is unaccountable that the Inspired * *Postsc. p. 76.*
' Historian would have omitted such a material Circumstance
' as this [of Summoning the Bishops.] Are there not many Cir-
cumstances omitted by the Inspired Historians; and must we re-
ceive nothing as Truth, which is related by others who lived
not long after 'em? To use Mr. B—'s Words *, ' What may not * *Postsc. p. 76.*
' this Gentleman pretend to say and prove, if we will allow
' him these precarious Suppositions against Matters of Fact?

* *Peſſic. p. 76.** *Verſe 14.** *Verſe 15.** *Chap. 21. v. 1.*

And again Mr. B— ſays *, ‘ The Inſpired Hiſtorian has deſtroy’d this vain Suppoſition of ſending a Summons before-hand to all the Biſhops of *Asia*. For as he pretends to prove from the beginning of the Chapter, St. Paul’s coming to *Miletus* was an accidental and unintended thing. For (ſays he) at the beginning of this Chapter, *Acts XX. 1, 2, 3, &c.* we ſee that the Apoſtle came from *Macedonia* into *Greece*, and thence deſign’d to Sail into *Syria*; but upon Notice of the *Jews lying in wait for him*, he alter’d his Purpoſe, and return’d back into *Macedonia*, and thence into *Asia*. But if we conſider the Order of the Apoſtle’s Voyage and Travels from *Macedonia* into *Asia*, it will appear highly probable, nay evident, that he intended to go to *Miletus*, to meet theſe ſeveral Biſhops that ſtaid at *Ephesus* in Expectation of him. For * St. Paul’s Companions having by Agreement met him at *Aſſos*, took him into the Ship; and after they had left *Mitylene* and *Chios* *, they arriv’d at *Samos* (an Iſland lying off beyond *Ephesus*, the Place which St. Paul determin’d to Sail by.) After the Apoſtle arriv’d at *Samos*, he tarried at *Trogyllium* (a Sea-Port Town lying between *Ephesus* and *Miletus*.) From *Trogyllium* the next Day he came to *Miletus*. From *Miletus*, the Apoſtle having gotten from the Biſhops Aſſembled, and taken Ship, came * with a ſtreight Courſe unto the Iſland *Coos*, and ſo on to *Jeruſalem*. From all which it is ſo very plain, that the Apoſtle intended and reſolved with himſelf to go to *Miletus*, that I cannot but wonder the contrary Opinion ſhould ever be entertain’d by any Man, that pretends to have conſider’d the whole Chapter, but eſpecially that has view’d the Map of the Apoſtle’s Voyage and Travels. The Apoſtle arriv’d at an Iſland lying off between *Ephesus* and *Miletus*; from this Iſland he lands at a Town between *Ephesus* and *Miletus*; and from this Town he goes directly to *Miletus*: Thence to no other Inland Town, but Sails away from thoſe Parts by *Coos*, &c. to *Jeruſalem*. Now if the Apoſtle did not intend to go to *Miletus*, why did he leave *Trogyllium* in order to come to *Miletus*? Or why did he not go afterwards to ſome other Inland Town? Nay (if I may be allow’d to give my Conjecture in this matter) the Apoſtle ſeems to have gone to *Trogyllium*, and to have tarried there (it being half way between *Ephesus* and *Miletus*, i. e. five Miles) for Diſpatch ſake; for while St. Paul was going the other five Miles to *Miletus*, the Meſſenger might have gone to *Ephesus*, and given Notice of St. Paul’s coming, to the Elders or Biſhops Aſſembled there in Expectation of him. And conſequently the Elders at *Ephesus* muſt

must have had notice of St. Paul's Landing, by a Messenger sent from *Trogyllum*, much sooner than they could possibly have had, if the Messenger had been sent from *Miletus*, *Miletus* being distant from *Ephesus* ten Miles, and *Trogyllum* only five.

Mr. B---'s *Second Exception* * is against my Interpretation of the Word *Church*, whereby I endeavour'd to overthrow the Argument produced by Mr. B---, to prove that the Elders here mentioned were only the Presbyters of one Congregation. And, * *Postscr. pag. 76, 77.*

1st. I said that the Original Word for *Church* may be Translated *Assembly*, as I prov'd it was, Chap. 19. v. 40. Now against this Mr. B--- says *, 'This Translation makes the Expressions of 'the Inspired Writer to be a meer *Tautology*, q. d. He sent to *Ephesus*, to call the Elders of the Company of Elders assembled there. Whereas the Words in my *Answer* are, *He sent for the Elders of the Assembly*. And is this a *Tautology*? Pray shew me wherein the *Tautology* does consist. At Mr. B---'s rate of *Arguing*, it's a meer *Tautology* to say, *The Clergy in or of the Convocation in Dublin*, q. d. *the Clergy in the Company of the Clergy assembled there*. But says Mr. B---, *ἐκκλησία* never in Scripture signifies an *Assembly of Elders*. What then? it is enough to my Purpose, that it signifies an *Assembly* in general in Scripture. But that Mr. B--- may have all possible Satisfaction in this Matter, I'll produce a place of Scripture wherein *ἐκκλησία* is taken not for the *Church*, but for an *Assembly of Elders*. The Place is *Acts XV. 22*. *Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church*. Which Dr. *Lightfoot* in the *Assembly at Westminster* shew'd, ought to be interpreted *the Meeting of the Council or Assembly*. For when the Proposition concerning the Members of a Synod was put, 'That Pastors and Teachers, and other fitting Persons are constituent Members of a Synod: Dr. *Lightfoot* oppos'd it, and gave his Interpretation of the *Brethren* and the *whole Church*, *Acts XV. viz.* That by *Brethren* was meant the *Uncircumcised Converts*, as v. 1 and 23; and that it was most likely that the Churches of the *Uncircumcised* would send their *Ministers*, and not *Laymen*. And that by *ἐκκλησία* was meant, not the *Church*, but the *Meeting of the Council* *. This Interpretation of Dr. *Lightfoot* is also confirmed by what Dr. *Mills* hath observed in his *Annotations upon verse 23*, *The Apostles, and Elders and Brethren*. In many Copies he tells us, it's read, *the Apostles, and Elders Brethren*, without the Conjunction *and*. In others, the Words [and Brethren] are omitted. * *Lightfoot's Life, P. 5.*

2^{dly}. I said, that *Church*, v. 17. must be the same with the *Church of God*, which he purchased with his own Blood. v. 28. And that several

An Examination of

ral Congregations dispers'd through a large Province, might be called the Church, or Church of God, which he hath purchased with
 * *Post. p. 77.* his own Blood. To this Mr. B— replies *. ' That the Inspired
 ' Writers do always vary their Expressions, and call the Chri-
 ' stians of a City or Town, a Church; but the Christian Congregations
 ' of a Province, Churches in the Plural Number. Let Mr. B—
 shew any Grounds for this Distinction from the Apostle's Speech
 here in this Place. On the contrary, all the Circumstances of
 the Passage being consider'd, there does appear great Reason to
 apply the Word Church in a more large and general Signification,
 even to signify many Congregations dispersed through a large Province.

Mr. B—'s Third Exception is against the Argument I have of-
 fer'd to prove, that the whole Clergy of Asia, at least the chief Pastors
 and Bishops were present, when St. Paul made this Speech to 'em :
 Which Argument I grounded on these Words. And when they
 were come to him, he said to 'em, Ye know from the first Day that I came
 into Asia, after what manner I have been with you; and I know that
 you all, among whom I have gone Preaching the Kingdom of God, shall
 * *Post. p. 78.* see my Face no more. Now to this Mr. B— replies *. Mr. Fr—
 ' may as well from these Words infer, that all the Christians of
 ' Asia were present at this Valedictory Speech, as that all the
 ' Bishops of Asia were, because he mentions all, among whom he
 ' had gone Preaching the Kingdom of God, and whom he had Taught Pub-
 ' lickly, and from House to House. But the unreasonableness of this
 Reply made by Mr. B— appears from hence, that the Inspired
 Historian does particularly tell us, v. 17. that St. Paul sent to E-
 phesus, and called the Elders of the Church. The Elders then of the
 Church, who alone were called, must only be understood by these
 Words. Ye all, among whom I have gone Preaching, &c. And whereas
 * *Ibid.* Mr. B— says *, ' that since of the three Years that the Apostle
 ' spent in Asia, he Preach'd three Months in the Synagogues of
 ' the Jews at Ephesus, two Years in the School of Tyrannus there,
 ' and only nine Months in the other Cities; the Apostle there-
 ' fore might with the greatest Propriety of Speech appeal to the
 ' Elders of Ephesus, who had the most of that time the opportuni-
 ' ty of Personal Converse with him, concerning his Preaching
 ' and Conversation among 'em, and direct to 'em these Words :
 ' Ye know from the first Day that I came, &c. I must confess, I see
 no reason for this Mr. B—'s Supposition. It's plain that St. Paul
 had made a very great Number of Converts in every Place,
 from the Words of Demetrius, Chap. XIX. v. 26. Ye see and hear
 that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul
 hath

both persuaded and turned away much People, *ἵνα μὴ ὄχλος*, why then does Mr. B— suppose that the Apostle appeals only to the Elders of Ephesus, concerning his Preaching and Conversation among 'em; when with equal Reason he might, and ought to have appeal'd to others (besides those Elders of Ephesus) among whom he had gone Preaching the Gospel? Those Words therefore of the Apostle, *Ye all, among whom I have, &c.* are most large and comprehensive; and with the greatest Propriety do include all the Elders, or Bishops of Asia. To conclude then this Argument: Mr. F— hath so little Reason to affirm concerning himself *, 'what I have already' *Postsc. p. 77.* 'said against his two first Arguments quite overthrows the Force of this; that I think even what he has here added, does plainly appear to be a further Confirmation of it.

Mr. B—'s Fourth Exception is contained in what he calls an Argument *ad hominem* *. 'If these Elders were Bishops in a proper' *Postsc. p. 78.* 'Sense (i. e. Diocesan ones;) then I hope Mr. Fr--- will at least 'allow Ephesus, the Metropolis of Asia, the same Priviledge 'with the rest of those Cities, viz. to have had a Diocesan Bishop of their own: And then, what occasion had the Apostle 'some Years after (as he pretends) to constitute Timothy as their 'Diocesan, unless he supposes their first Diocesan to have 'dy'd in the mean time? And even on that Supposition, how 'comes their pretended Line of Succession to be derived from 'Timothy, as their first Bishop? So inconsistent is one part of his 'Answer with the other. The whole Force of this Argument depends upon a Supposition, which I see no Reason to allow, viz. That at this time Ephesus had a Bishop Presiding and Governing it, as well as the other Cities, I am of opinion that St. Paul continued the Government of this Church in his own Hands till the Year 64, in which he constituted Timothy the first Bishop of it. For had there been a Bishop of Ephesus at this time, when St. Paul assembled the Elders or Bishops of Asia at Miletus, he had certainly been mention'd in the Catalogues, by some of the Historians. I desire therefore Mr. F--- would either withdraw, or make good that injurious Reflection he has cast upon me in these Words: 'So inconsistent is one part of his Answer with the other. But says Mr. B---, 'Why should not Ephesus, the Metropolis of Asia, have 'the same Priviledge with the rest of those Cities, viz. have a 'Diocesan Bishop of their own? I think this is a sufficient Answer; that whatever his Reasons were, St. Paul did not appoint a Bishop of Ephesus before the Year 64, when Timothy was appointed by him. And if Mr. B--- will ask me the Reasons of the
the

An Examination of

the Apostle's Action ; I use the same Liberty, and ask him, Why St. Paul did not appoint *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus* much sooner than he did, seeing he had appointed Bishops in other Cities?

Mr. B---'s *Fifth Exception* is against our Opinion concerning *Epaphroditus*, whom we affirm to have been Bishop of *Philippi*, and present at *Rome* with St. Paul. This our Opinion we grounded upon the Authority of several Ancient Fathers of the Church, *Theodoret*, *Chrysostom*, *Theophylact*, and others *. Now in opposition to this, Mr. B--- insists upon the *Translation* [in other Places he can alter the *Translation*, even against the common Opinion of all Interpreters, when he thinks such an Alteration is for his Purpose.] And indeed, tho' I do not deny the Truth of the *Translation* ; yet I can see no Reason why something more than what is express'd in the *Translation*, may not be imply'd in the Original, since the Word will very well bear it ; so that *Your Apostle* in the Original *, but in our Translation *Your Messenger*, denotes both that *Epaphroditus* was their Bishop, and also at this time carry'd their Liberality to St. Paul. By this Explication the different Opinions of Interpreters on this Place are easily reconcil'd ; and that due Regard paid to the Opinion and Judgment of the *Primitive Fathers*, which they do deserve.

* In loc.

* Phil. Ch. 2.
w. 25.

C H A P. VII.

Wherein are mentioned several Passages of the Fourth and Fifth Sections of my Answer ; which Mr. B--- hath either overlook'd, or misrepresented.

* Pag. 3, 4.

SOME of these I have already mention'd *, as HIS ADDING TO SCRIPTURE, and ALTERING THE TRANSLATION, even against the common Opinion of all Interpreters. — But to proceed.

* Answ. p. 15.

1. One Argument whereby Mr. F--- endeavour'd to prove, that the Elders sent for by St. Paul to *Miletus* from *Ephesus*, were not Bishops (as I observ'd *) was, ' This could not be, unless we suppose the greatest part of them to have been *Scandalous Non-Residents*, and to have learn'd the Modern Practice of spending the greatest part of their Time out of their own Diocess, and at a distance from their pretended Charge. To obviate

viate this Objection, I shew'd, that St. Paul would not have sent for these Bishops, and thereby have made himself accessary to so great a Crime as *Scandalous Non-Residence*; which is yet justly chargeable upon St. Paul, if there be any Force in Mr. B---'s Objection. Nay further, I shew'd that these Bishops being sent for by a Summons from St. Paul (according to Mr. B---'s own Opinion and way of Reasoning in his *Appendix*) they could not be *Scandalous Non-Residents*: For he himself allows, that such a Summons does excuse any Person's Absence from his Charge upon any important Business, from the Imputation of *Scandalous Non-Residence*. To all which Mr. B--- * is pleas'd to make this Reply, not only uncivil, but containing a *gross and palpable Mistake*. And for Mr. Fr---, I must advise him to read more carefully what he pretends to Answer; and then he could never have run into so gross a Mistake, as to imagine that I think a Bishop's short Absence from his Charge upon important and necessary Occasions, to be *Scandalous Non-Residence*, when I have so expressly explain'd it, of a Man's spending the greatest part of his Time at a distance from his Charge. Let now the Reader judge, whether I gave any Reason for this Reflection of Mr. B---; whether I did not very well understand his Opinion, and shew plainly from it, that he was *inconsistent with himself*; in one place allowing, that Persons upon a Summons absent from their Charge, cannot be call'd *Scandalous Non-Residents*; and yet here affirming, that these Elders thus absent would be *Scandalous Non-Residents*. Besides, Mr. B---, instead of mending the Matter, hath unhappily made it worse; for he really supposes in his Argument which I just now recited, that if these Elders or Bishops had met at Ephesus in Expectation of St. Paul, they must have spent the greatest part of their Time at a distance from their Charge. I hope Mr. B--- will be convinc'd, that he has plainly misrepresented me: And I must desire him to read more carefully what I have said, and at his Leisure to give an Answer to it.

2. I prov'd that if the Elders sent for to *Miletus*, were only Presbyters of a particular Church or Congregation, as Mr. B--- pretend'd; they must also, upon his Supposition or Notion of *Scandalous Non-Residence* in his Argument, have been *Scandalous Non-Residents*. This Argument Mr. B--- hath quite over-look'd, and given no Answer to in his *Postscript*.

3. I examin'd * all the several Arguments, whereby Mr. B--- * *Vid. Answer* endeavour'd to prove his Opinion from Phil. I. 1. which were P. 21, 22. four, and gave particular Answers to each of them: But all this Mr. B--- hath quite over-look'd in his *Postscript*.

4. I

An Examination of

4. I gave particular and distinct Answers to the Arguments Mr. B--- brought for his Opinion, from the Epistle to *Titus* and *1 Tim. Chap. III. v. 1.* his own Text : But all this he has quite over-look'd in his *Postscript*.

6. Nay, I observ'd how *unfairly* and *disingeniously* Mr. B--- had treated Dr. *Whitby*, whom he call'd a *Learned Commentator* : And yet he hath said nothing by way of Vindication of himself in his *Postscript*.

I hope Mr. B--- will be pleas'd to consider all these Particulars, and vouchsafe an Answer to 'em. The same Favour I must desire from him, with Respect to the 5th Section of my *Answer*, [wherein I consider at large his several Arguments from *1 Thess. V. 12, 13.* and *Heb. XIII. 17.*] to which I find no Reply in his *Postscript*.

C H A P. VIII.

Wherein is shew'd to what Mr. B— hath Reply'd, or omitted to Reply, in the 6th and 7th Section of my Answer.

* *Postsc. pag. I.*
115, &c.

MR. B--- does indeed endeavour* to overthrow the Credit of Bp. *Pearson's* Chronological Account, concerning *Timothy* and *Titus*. But notwithstanding what he has offer'd in Opposition to it, I still insist upon the Truth of it; and do promise Mr. B--- a large Proof and Confirmation of it, whenever he vouchsafes an Answer to this Book of mine, and the several Particulars I have objected against him. In the mean time let me observe, that this Chronological Account of Bp. *Pearson* is put out with the Approbation and Consent of Mr. *Dodwell*, who in the Opinion of all Men, but Mr. B—, is a Man of *vast Learning*, and great Judgment in Chronology.

2. Mr. B— has given no Answer to the several Arguments whereby I prov'd that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not *Evangelists*, as he pretended; nor to the several Exceptions I made against his Arguments for his Opinion.

3. Mr. B— has also given no Answer to the whole 7th Section of my *Answer*, wherein I particularly propos'd and consider'd the Reasons of his Non-Conformity, upon a Supposition that Episcopacy, or Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, was only an Human Constitution.

C H A P. IX.

Wherein is consider'd to what Mr. B— hath Reply'd, or omitted to Reply against me, in Reference to his Appendix.

1. **M**R. B— hath made no Reply to what I offer'd concerning the Author *De Censurâ Temp rum* *; or concerning the Words *Priests* and *Clergy* *, about which he made so great a Noise; or concerning Mr. Hales of Eaton, whose Judgment he himself so very much insisted upon. * Answ. pag. 41, 42. Answ. P. 43, 44, 45.

2. Nay, he has given no particular Answer to the several Exceptions I made * against the Arguments brought by him to prove, that St. James was not Bishop of Jerusalem; nor to the Testimony of so many Ancient Authors, Jerome, Eusebius, Clemens Alexandrinus, Hegesippus, Ruffinus, Epiphanius, &c. All which Authors do agree, that St. James was Bishop of Jerusalem. Instead of duly considering these Proofs against his Opinion, he has been guilty of two gross and palpable Mistakes [such as Mr. B— would have call'd *Prevarication* in another Man; and with great Assurance have desir'd the Person in his Opinion guilty of 'em, to clear his own Sincerity in, because they carry a shrewd Appearance of very unfair Dealing *.] * Answ. pag. 49, 50. * Mr. B—'s Rem. p. 2.

1st Mistake is in his Representation of my Words. Mr. B— makes me to say *, 'That James had Authority, we say that of a Bishop, J. B. that of a Moderator. But here (says he) I must beg his Pardon, I say that of an Apostle. Whereas my Words are *, 'From all which (i. e. from the Account given in Scripture of St. James) we may conclude, that St. James had some Authority, we say, that of a Bishop, and we produce the Testimonies of many Authors; J. E. says only that of a Moderator, and produces no Testimony but what he calls an *Ingenious Conjecture* of Mr. Basnage. I appeal to the Eyes and Judgment of the Reader, whether, to speak modestly, Mr. B— has not plainly mistaken in representing my Words, and left out something very material. And whereas Mr. B— says, 'But here I must beg his Pardon, I say that of an Apostle. I always did believe it was Mr. B—'s Opinion that St. James was an Apostle; and accordingly argu'd against him, that thô St. James was an Apostle, yet he might be, and was Bishop of Jerusalem: Which Mr. B— positively denying, affirmed in express Words, that St. James was not Bishop, but a constant *Præses* or Moderator of the Council of

' *Presbyters* there. This Account he gave of the Ancient Writers calling St. *James* Bishop of *Jerusalem*; but never in his *Appendix* or *Postscript* prov'd what he so confidently affirmed. I desire him now to prove it.

* *Postsc. P. 108.* 2d Mistake is in applying what Dr. *Barrow* hath said concerning St. *Peter* to St. *James* *: Whereas Dr. *Barrow* himself positively affirms the two Cases to be very different, as I shall shew immediately in his own Words.

* Page 107.

If the Reader be pleas'd to look into Mr. B—'s *Postscript* *, he will find, that Mr. B— does with great Pomp and Ostentation produce the Arguments whereby Dr. *Barrow* proves, that St. *Peter* was not Bishop of *Rome*, and does at large Transcribe 'em. ' Now (says Mr. B---, big with an Opinion of the concurring Judgment of Dr. *Barrow*) ' if St. *James* was one of the Twelve, or an Apostle at all, I must still say 'tis a Degradation of him, to make ' him the Bishop of the Church of any particular City. And because these Gentlemen are pleas'd to slight this Argument as ' us'd by me, I will present it to them as enforced by the Reasons of an Author to whom, I suppose, they both pay a greater Veneration. *Quid dignum tanto, &c.* So full of Dr. *Barrow*'s Enforcement of this his Argument is Mr. B---, that ' for Dr. *Barrow*'s sake, he bespeaks Mr. Fr---'s further Exercise of Patience. Indeed, Mr. B---, as your weak Reasoning formerly did, so now your unfair and disingenuous Treatment of Dr. *Barrow* does much more provoke my Patience; And I think I may bespeak (if I may be allow'd to use such an Expression) Dr. *Barrow*'s Patience for Mr. B---'s sake. Pray Mr. B---, read Page 88, 89, of the *Pope's Supremacy*, and tell me, does not Dr. *Barrow* disown that the Arguments he us'd in the Case of St. *Peter*, are justly applicable to, or have any Evidence or Weight in the Case of St. *James*. The Doctor's Words are these.

' If in Objection to some of these Discourses, it is alledged, ' that St. *James* our Lord's near Kinsman, altho' he was an Apostle, was made Bishop of *Jerusalem*; and that for the like Reason St. *Peter* might assume the Bishoprick of *Rome*; I answer.

' 1. It is not certain, that St. *James* the Bishop of *Jerusalem* ' was an Apostle (meaning an Apostle of the Primary Rank;) ' for *Eusebius* (the greatest Antiquary of old Times) doth reckon ' him one of the Seventy Disciples.

' So doth the Author of the Apostolical Constitution in divers places suppose.

‘ *Hegeſippus* (that moſt Ancient Hiſtorian) was of the ſame mind, who ſaith, that *there were many of this Name*, and that *this James did undertake the Church with the Apoſtles*.

‘ Of the ſame Opinion was *Epiphanius*, who ſaith, that *St. James* was the Son of *Joſeph* by another Wife.

‘ The whole Greek Church doth ſuppoſe the ſame, keeping three diſtinct Solemnities for him, and the two Apoſtles of the ſame Name.

‘ *Gregory Nyſſene*, *St. Hierom*, and divers other Ancient Writers, do concur herein, whom we may ſee alledged by *Grotius*, *Dr. Hammond*, (who themſelves did embrace the ſame Opinion) *Valeſius*, *Blondell*, &c.

‘ *Salmaſius* (after his confident manner) ſaith, *It is certain that he was not one of the Twelve*; I may at leaſt ſay, it is not certain that he was, and conſequently the Objection is grounded on an Uncertainty.

‘ 2. Granting that *St. James* was one of the Apoſtles (as ſome of the Ancients ſeem to think, calling him an Apoſtle; and as divers Modern Divines conceive, grounding chiefly upon theſe Words of *St. Paul*, *But other of the Apoſtles ſaw I none, ſave James the Lord's Brother*, and taking Apoſtles there in the ſtrict-eſt Senſe) I anſwer,

‘ That the Caſe was peculiar, and there doth appear a ſpecial Reaſon why one of the Apoſtles ſhould be deſign'd to make a conſtant Reſidence at *Jeruſalem*, and conſtantly to preſide there like a Biſhop. For *Jeruſalem* was the *Metropolis*, the Fountain, the Centre of the Chriſtian Religion, where it had Birth, where was greateſt matter and occaſion of propagating the Goſpel, moſt People diſpoſed to embrace it reſorting thither; where the Church was very numerous, conſiſting, as *St. Luke* (or *St. James* in him) doth intimate, *of divers Myriads of believing Jews*; whence it might ſeem expedient, that a Perſon of greateſt Authority ſhould be fixed there for the confirming and improving that Church, together with the Propagation of Religion among the People, which reſorted thither; the which might induce the Apoſtles to ſettle *St. James* there, both for diſcharging the Office of an Apoſtle, and the ſupplying the Room of a Biſhop there.

‘ According to him (ſaith *Eusebius*) *The Episcopical Throne was committed by the Apoſtles*; or our Lord (ſaith *Epiphanius*) *did entrust him with his own Throne*.

An Examination of

‘ But there was no need of fixing an Apostle at other places ;
 ‘ nor doth it appear that any was so fixed ; especially
 ‘ St. Peter was incapable of such an Employment, requiring
 ‘ Settlement and constant Attendance, who beside his general
 ‘ Apostleship had a peculiar Apostleship of the dispersed *Jews*
 ‘ committed to him ; who therefore was much engaged in Tra-
 ‘ vel for Propagation of the Faith, and edifying his Converts
 ‘ every where.

‘ 3. The great Consent of the most Ancient Writers making
 ‘ St. James not to have been one of the Twelve Apostles, it is
 ‘ thence accountable, why (as before noted) St. James was
 ‘ called by some Ancient Writers, *the Bishop of Bishops, the Prince*
 ‘ *of Bishops, &c.* because he was the first Bishop, of the *first See,*
 ‘ the Mother Church ; the Apostles being excluded from the
 ‘ Comparison.

Add to this what Dr. Barrow further says concerning St. James
 * *Pope's Supr. being Bishop of Jerusalem* *.

p. 71. To the same Purpose we find the Learned Selden speaking out
 † *Lib. de Sy- of Grotius †. De Jacobo Epistolæ Canonicae, &c. i. e. Of James*
 ned. 2. cap. 7. the Author of the Canonical Epistle. He it is who was ap-
 p. 334. pointed by the Apostles, Prince of the Council of Presbyters
 ‘ at Jerusalem, that whilst the Apostles Travell'd from Place to
 ‘ Place that Council might have a Person of Eminency, and for
 ‘ his great Virtues called the *Just*, to govern there.

* *Postsc. p. 87.* ‘ And now (to use Mr. B---'s own Words *) -Mr. B--- may see
 ‘ what he will make of his Argument enforced by the Reasons
 ‘ of an Author whom he supposes [*and very justly too*] I pay a
 ‘ greater Veneration than to himself. Dr. Barrow asserts 'tis a
 ‘ Degradation of St. Peter, to make him the Bishop of the
 ‘ Church of any particular City : [*I allow this.*] So does he as-
 ‘ sert, 'tis a Degradation of St. James to make him the Bishop
 ‘ of the Church of any particular City. [*Sure, Mr. B---, you*
 ‘ *will not say this, when the Passage I quoted out of Dr. Barrow*
 ‘ *does so expressly declare the contrary.*] ‘ Where is the Conse-
 ‘ quence ? Of this Conclusion there is not one Syllable in
 ‘ Dr. Barrow : 'Tis wholly Mr. B---'s precarious Assertion. Nay,
 ‘ 'tis inconsistent with what Dr. Barrow plainly asserts concerning
 ‘ St. James. So that at Mr. B---'s rate of arguing we may infer,
 ‘ that Dr. Barrow asserts 'tis a Degradation of St. James, to make
 ‘ him a Bishop of Jerusalem. But the plain Inference that
 ‘ should be drawn from the Passage is, that Dr. Barrow never
 ‘ dream'd of any Degradation of St. James, by making him Bp.
 ‘ of Jerusalem. ‘ So

' So that * if ever Mr. B— read and consider'd the Passage I * Mr. B—'s
' quoted out of Dr. Barrow, I cannot excuse him from the Guilt *Remarks, p. 6.*
' of downright *Falshood* and *Prevarication*; for 'tis not possible to
' produce a more palpable Instance of it. If he never consi-
' der'd it at all (as I am in Charity inclin'd to believe, because
' the Falsification appears to every Reader at first view) he
' should beware of suffering his Ill Will and Prejudice to blind
' his Judgment so far, as to *expose himself*, instead of exposing
' Mr. Fr— to the just Censure of the Publick.

[*To use Mr. B—'s Apology upon another Occasion.*] The Reader may
make ' this * to be one of Mr. Fr—'s *Scurrilous* and *Abusive Reflections*; * Mr. B—'s
' whereas in Truth those are not Mr. Fr—'s, but Mr. B—'s Words, *Remarks, p. 2.*
' and are cited by Mr. Fr— as his; and the Book refer'd to in the
' Margin wherein they are to be found: So that Mr. B—, and not
' Mr. Fr—, is answerable for the pretended Scurrility of them.

Thus have I finish'd my Design, and Answer'd the several
particular Arguments which Mr. B— has us'd against me in his
Postscript. It only remains, that I say something by way of
Answer to the several Passages Mr. L— has produced in his
Postscript *, out of Dr. Stillingfleet's *Irenicum* against *Episcopacy*, as
receiv'd and establish'd in our Church. And here I shall recite
several Passages in Favour of *Episcopacy*, out of Dr. Stillingfleet's
Writings, published many Years after his *Irenicum*; from whence
it will appear that the Doctor did *alter his Judgment* and Opinion
concerning these Matters. ** Pag. 55, 93, 134, 136, 145, 146, 153.*

To the *Author of the Christian Temper*, the last who appear'd a-
gainst the Doctor's Sermon, and who design'd to *commit the*
Rector of Sutton † *with the Dean of St. Paul's*, Dr. Stillingfleet says *. * *Preface to the*
' The Design of that Author is to pick up all the Passages he *Unreasonable-*
' could meet with (in a Book written twenty Years since) with *ness of Separation, p. 71, 72.*
' great Tenderneß towards the *Dissenters*, before the *Laws* were
' *Establish'd*. As though, as Mr. Cotton once answer'd in a like
' Case, there were no weighty Argument to be found, but what might
' be gather'd from the weakneß or unwarineß of my Expressions. And,
' Have you not very well requited the *Author* of that Book for
' the Tenderneß and Pity he had for you, and the Concern-
' ment he then expressed, to have brought you in, upon *easier*
' Terms than were since required? And, Hath he now deserved
' this at your Hands, to have them all *thrown in his Face*, and to
' be thus upbraided with his former Kindneß? Is this your *Ingr-*

† Note, Dr. Stillingfleet was Rector of Sutton when he wrote his *Irenicum*.

An Examination of

nuity, your Gratitude, your Christian Temper? Are you afraid of having too many Friends, that you thus use those, whom you once took to be such.

* Pref. to Unreasonableness of Sep. p. 72.

[And again *] 'When you think it reasonable, that upon longer Time and farther Consideration, those Divines of the Assembly, who then opposed Separation, should change their Opinions; Will you not allow one single Person, who happen'd to Write about these Matters when he was very young; in twenty Years time of the most busie and thoughtful part of his Life, to see reason to alter his Judgment? But after all this, wherein is it that he hath thus contradicted himself? Is it in the Point of Separation, which is the present Business? No, so far from it, that in that very Book he speaks as fully concerning the Unlawfulness of Separation, as in this Sermon. [And afterwards *.]

* Ibid. p. 73.

'Why then do you make such a Stir about other Passages in that Book, and take so little notice of these, which are most pertinent and material?

* Ibid. p. 76.

[And again *.] 'If any thing in the following Treatise be found different from the Sense of that Book, I do intreat them to allow me that which I heartily wish to them, viz. that in Twenty Years time we may arrive to such maturity of Thoughts, as to see reason to change our Opinion of some things; and I wish I had not Cause to add, of some Persons too.

From all these Expressions the Reader may see what Dr. Stillingfleet's Opinion was of his Irenicum; the Passages following do shew his Judgment concerning Episcopacy, as receiv'd in the Establish'd Church.

* Ibid. p. 5.

* 'It will be very hard to perswade any considering Men, that the Christian Church should degenerate so soon, so unanimously, so universally, as it must do, if Episcopal Government, and the use of some significant Ceremonies were any parts of that Apostacy. Will it not seem strange to them, that when some Human Politics have preserved their First Constitution so long, without any considerable Alteration, that the Government instituted by Christ, and settled by his Apostles, should so soon after be changed into another kind, and that so easily, so insensibly, that all the Christian Churches believed they had still the same Government which the Apostles left them? Which is a matter so incredible, that, &c. [And afterwards.] 'Those who forego the Testimony of Antiquity, as all the Opposers of the Church of England must do, must unavoidably run into insuperable Difficulties in dealing with the Papists, which the Principles of our Church do lead us through.

* Did

* ' Did not Cranmer and Ridley, and Hooper, and Farrar, and * Pref. to Un-
' Latimer, all Bishops of this Church, suffer Martyrdom by their [i. e. the Papists] Means? Had not they the same kind of Episcopacy of reasonable-
' which is now among us; and which some now are so busie in of Sep. P. 9.
' seeking to destroy, by publishing one Book after another, on
' purpose to represent it as unlawful and inconsistent with the Pri-
' mitive Institution?

' While Harding, Sanders, and others attacked our Church on one * Ibid. p. 14. out
' side; Coleman, Button, Hallingham, Benson, and others were of Cambden's
' as busie on the other; who, under pretence of a purer Reformation, op- Annal. Eliz.
' posed the Discipline, Liturgy, and Calling of our Bishops, as approach- A. D. 1568.
' ing too near to the Church of Rome.

* ' Our Diocesan Episcopacy is the same for Substance which was in * Unreasona-
' the Primitive Church. [And again†.] ' In Cities and Dioceses which bleness of Sep.
' were under the Care of one Bishop, there were several Congrega- P. 244.
' tions and Altars, and distant Places. † Page 249.

* ' That our Church did believe our Bishops to succeed the Apo- * Ibid. p. 269.
' stles in those parts [i. e. Government, Ordination and Censures] of
' their Office, I shall make appear by these things. (1.) In the
' Preface before the Book of Ordination, it is said, That it is evident
' unto all Men, diligently reading Holy Scripture, and Ancient Authors,
' that from the Apostles time, there have been these Orders of Ministers in
' Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests and Deacons. What is the reason
' that they express it thus, from the Apostles time, rather than in
' the Apostles times; but that they believ'd, while the Apostles li-
' ved, they managed the Affairs of Government themselves;
' but as they withdrew, they did in some Churches sooner, and
' in some later, as their own Continuance, the Condition of the
' Churches, and the Qualification of Persons were, commit the
' Care and Government of Churches to such Persons whom they
' appointed thereto? Of which, we have an uncontrollable E-
' vidence in the Instances of Timothy and Titus; for the Care of
' Government was a distinct thing from the Office of an Evangelist;
' and all their Removes do not invalidate this, because while
' the Apostles lived, it is probable there were no Bishops, or but
' few. But as they went off, so they came to be settled in their
' several Churches. And as this is most agreeable to the Sense of
' our Church, so it is the fairest Hypothesis for reconciling the diffe-
' rent Testimonies of Antiquity. For hereby the Succession of Bi-
' shops is secured from the Apostles times, for which the Testimo-
' nies of Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, and others, are so plain;
' hereby room is left to make good all that St. Jerome hath said;
' and

An Examination of

‘ and what *Epiphanius* delivers concerning the differing *Settlements* of *Churches* at first. So that we may allow for the *Community* of Names, between *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, for a while in the *Church*, i. e. while the *Apostles* governed the *Churches* themselves; but afterwards, that which was then part of the *Apostolical Office*, became the *Episcopal*, which hath continued from that time to this, by a constant *Succession* in the *Church*.] Which *Dr. Stillingfleet* further proves from the Testimonies of *Arch-Bishop Whitgift*, *Bishop Bilson*, *King CHARLES* the First’s Papers, and
 * *Ibid.* P. 272. says *, Many other Passages might be produced out of those
 ‘ *Excellent Papers* to the same purpose, but these are sufficient to
 ‘ discover that our *Bishops* are looked on as *Successors* to the *Apo-*
 ‘ *stles*; and therefore *Mr. Baxter* hath no reason to call our *E-*
 ‘ *piscopacy* a new devised *Species* of *Churches*, and such as destroys
 ‘ the being of *Parochial Churches*.

To these Passages I shall add a few others collected out of the *Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy*; a Book Publish’d by *Bp. Stillingfleet* about Twenty Years after his *Unreasonableness* of *Separation*.

* Page 5.

* ‘ In several Places he [i. e. *St. Jerome*] makes the *Bishops* to be *Suc-*
 ‘ *cessors of the Apostles*, as well as the rest of the most *Eminent Fathers*
 ‘ of the *Church* have done. If the *Apostolical Office*, as far as it con-
 ‘ cerns the *Care and Government* of the *Churches*, were not to
 ‘ continue after their *Decease*, how came the best of the most
 ‘ *Learned*, the nearest to the *Apostolical Times*, to be so won-
 ‘ derfully deceiv’d? For if the *Bishops* did not succeed by the
 ‘ *Apostles* own *Appointment*, they must be *Intruders* and *Usurpers*
 ‘ of the *Apostolical Function*; and can we imagine the *Church* of
 ‘ *God* would have so universally consented to it? Besides the
 ‘ *Apostles* did not die all at once; but there were *Successors* in
 ‘ several of the *Apostolical Churches*, while some of the *Apostles*
 ‘ were living: Can we again imagine, those would not have
 ‘ vindicated the *Right* of their own *Order*, and declared to the
 ‘ *Church*, That *this Office* was peculiar to themselves? The
 ‘ *Change* of the Name from *Apostles* to *Bishops*, would not have
 ‘ been sufficient *Excuse* for them; for the *Presumption* had been
 ‘ as great in the *Exercise* of the *Power* without the Name. So
 ‘ that I can see no *Medium*, but that either the *Primitive Bishops*
 ‘ did succeed the *Apostles* by *their own Appointment* and *Approbation*,
 ‘ (which *Irenæus* expressly affirms, *Qui ab Apostolis ipsis instituti sunt*
 ‘ *Episcopi in Ecclesiis*) or else those who governed the *Apostolical*
 ‘ *Churches* after them, out-went *Diotrephes* himself; for he only
 ‘ rejected

rejected those whom the *Apostles* sent ; but these assumed to themselves the Exercise of an *Apostolical* Authority over the Churches planted and settled by them.

But to let us see how far the *Apostles* were from thinking that this Part of their Office was peculiar to themselves ; we find them in their own time, as they saw occasion, to appoint others to take care of the Government of the Churches, within such Bounds as they thought fit. Thus *Timothy* was appointed by *St. Paul* at *Ephesus*.

[And again *.] And what was this Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, but the very same which the *Bishops* have exercised ever since the *Apostles* Times ? But they who go about to *Unbishop Timothy* and *Titus*, may as well *Unscripture the Epistles* that were written to them ; and make them only some particular and occasional Writings, as they make *Timothy* and *Titus* to have been only some particular and occasional Officers. But the *Christian Church* preserving these *Epistles*, as of constant and perpetual use, did thereby suppose the same kind of Office to continue, for the sake whereof those excellent *Epistles* were written : And we have no greater Assurance that these *Epistles* were written by *St. Paul*, than we have that there were *Bishops* to succeed the *Apostles* in the Care and Government of Churches. Page 8.

I have the more willingly given this Collection of several Passages out of *Bp. Stillingfleet's Unreasonableness of Separation, and Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy* : wherein he gives his Opinion concerning *Episcopacy* ; partly to invite *Mr. B—* and others to the reading of those valuable Books, in which the Reader will find, that the *Bishop* has alter'd his Opinion concerning *Episcopacy*, since he wrote his *Irenicum* ; and partly to put *Mr. B—* out of Countenance with his excessive Confidence, when he tells us *, speaking of the last Passage I quoted out of *Bp. Stillingfleet*. * *Postsc. p. 141.* These are at the best very incautious Expressions, and *Mr. Dr—* would have better consulted the Honour of that truly excellent Writer, to have pass'd them over in Silence. I am sure what I have now refer'd to in his *Irenicum*, carries another Force and Weight with it ; nor do I know that he ever retract-ed that excellent Book : But I am sure he never refuted the Argumentative Part of it. And his Judgment at the Writing of it appears to have been then very Impartial and Unbiass'd, and becoming the Noble Character he then assum'd of a Peace-maker.

with their Board as they thought fit. This Treaty was
pointed out to take care of the Government of the Chinese,
and them in their own right, as they saw occasion, to ap-
prove this Part of the Treaty. It was peculiar to themselves; we
But to see how far the English were from thinking
Churches planted and seated by them.

822

